DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 319 CS 203 451

AUTHOR Verner, Zenobia, Ed.
TITLE Literature.
INSTITUTION Texas Joint Council of Teachers of English, Houston.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 25p.; The Texas Joint Council of Teachers of English is an affiliate of the National Council of Teachers of English
JOURNAL CIT English in Texas; v8 n2 Entire Issue Win 1977

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Copyrights; Elective Courses; *English Instruction; Higher Education; *Literary Analysis; *Literature; *Literature Appreciation; Science Fiction; Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS Archetypes; Crane (Stephen); Frost (Robert); Shakespeare (William)

ABSTRACT

This issue provides a selection of articles about literature and the teaching of literature. Titles include "Sin, Salvation, and Grace in 'The Scarlet Letter,'" "'The Road Not Taken': A Study in Ambiguity," "In Search of Shakespeare: The Essential Years," "Right Deeds for Wrong Reasons: Teaching the Bible as Literature," "A Southern Author's Fight for International Copyright," "Invitation to Participate in Two Pilot Projects of TJCTE," "Designing a Science Fiction Elective," "Archetypaling in the Classroom, with Special Reference to Shakespeare," "The Claudius Cover-Up: A Psychology of Politics in 'Hamlet,'" and "Stephen Crane's Use of Animal Imagery in 'The Blue Hotel.'" (KS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED140319

ENGLISH IN TEXAS

Winter, 1977
Volume 8
Number 2

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Literature

Contributors:

John J. Pollock

James E. Barcus

J. F. Peirce

Elizabeth Gill

Patricia Lemley

James Lynch

Daniel R. Bronson

F. Allen Briggs

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Texas Joint Council of Teachers of English

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

CS 203451

Editor
Zenobia Verner, University of Houston, C & I Department, Houston, Texas 77004

Associate Editors
Ron Lindsey, Pasadena Independent School District, 3010 Bayshore Drive, Pasadena, Texas 77502.
Mary Beth Bauer, Aldine ISD, 14910 Aldine-Westfield Rd., Houston, 77032.

Editorial Consultants
Vera Hutchison, C & I, University of Houston, Houston, 77004.
Ernestine P. Sewell, University of Texas at Arlington, 76019
Pat Sullivan, West Texas State University, Canyon, 79015
Anne Terry, University of Houston at Clear Lake City, 2700 Bay Area Blvd., Houston, 77058

TJCTE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Executive Committee
President: Goldie West, 3210 W. Lancaster, Fort Worth, 76107
President-Elect: James Culp, 3315 20th Street, Lubbock, 79410
Vice-President, District Workshops: Beth Robinson, Box 175, Quitman, 75783
Vice-President, Membership: Lois Haney, Southwest Texas University, San Marcos, 78666
Vice-President, Programs: Neil Duncan, 1748 Westridge Drive, Hurst, 76053
Corresponding Secretary: Ann Jensen, 720 Stadium, Garland, 75040
Recording Secretary: Joanna Martin, 2729 South Broadway, Apt. 286, Tyler, 75701
Treasurer: Tommy Boley, Department of English, University of Texas at El Paso, El Paso, 79968

Affiliate Representatives
Greater Dallas Council: Thelma Gillum, 7106 Indian Ridge Trail, Dallas, 75232
Fort Worth Council: Mary Jo Clegg, 4424 Inwood Road Fort Worth, 76109
Houston Area Council: Vincent D'Amico, 6207 Reed Rd., Houston, 77017
Northeast Texas Area Council: Joanne Cockelreas, Dept. of English, ETSU, Commerce, 75428
San Antonio Area Council: Florence Lieb, San Antonio College, 1300 San Pedro, San Antonio, 78284
Southeast Texas Council: Kaaren Kline, P.O. Box 987, Bridge City, 77611
South Plains Area Council: W. B. Dickey, 4013 48th St., Lubbock, 79413
Spring Branch Council: Pat Farley, Spring Branch ISD, 955 Campbell Rd., Houston, 77024
Tyler-Longview Area Council: Billie Lofton, Pine Tree High School, Box 5878, Longview, 75601

Membership Committee Representatives
Four-Year College: Arney Strickland, Dept. of English, Lamar State University, Box 10023, Beaumont, 77710
(term expiring 3-30-78)
Two-Year College: Joe Melanie Calverley, Professor of English, Midland College, 3600 N. Garfield, Midland, 79701
(term expiring 3-30-77)
Supervisors: W. B. Dickey, 4013 48th St., Lubbock, 79413
(term expiring 3-30-77)
Elementary: Vera Hutchison, University of Houston, Houston, 77004
(term expiring 3-30-79)
Secondary: Doris Sprayberry, Rt. 1, Box 199, Anson, 79501
(term expiring 3-30-77)

Regional Representatives
Central: Martha Thomas, Division of Teacher Ed., TEA, Austin, 78701
(term expiring 3-30-79)
East: Joan Schlotter, 317 Turner, Huntsville, 77340
(term expiring 3-30-78)
North: Evelyn McMillen, 6010 Royal Crest Dr., Dallas, 75230
(term expiring 3-30-78)
South: Mavis Brown, Drawer 110, Corpus Christi, 78403
(term expiring 3-30-79)
West: Edith Smith, Amarillo ISD, 910 West 8th Ave., Amarillo, 79101
(term expiring 3-30-77)

Ex-Officio
Past President: Ozella Dew, P.O. Box 641, Tyler, 75701
NCTE Liaison: Alberta Maddox, Box 1591, Kingsville, 78363
(term expiring 3-30-77)
Editor, *English in Texas*: Zenobia Verner, University of Houston, C & I Department, Houston, 77004
(term expiring 5-30-78)
Executive Secretary: Fred Tarpley, East Texas State University, Commerce, 75428
(term expiring 3-30-79)

ENGLISH IN TEXAS

Volume 8, Number 2
Winter, 1977

literature

Sin, Salvation and Grace in the Scarlet Letter 27
JAMES E. BARCUS

"The Road Not Taken" a study in ambiguity 28
JOHN J. POLLOCK

In Search of Shakespeare: the Essential Years 30
J. F. PEIRCE

Right Deeds for Wrong Reasons: Teaching the Bible as Literature 34
JAMES E. BARCUS

A Southern Author's Fight for International Copyright 36
ELIZABETH GILL

Invitation to Participate in Two Pilot Projects of TJCTE 38

Designing a Science Fiction Elective 39
PATRICIA LEMLEY

Archetypaling in the Classroom with Special Reference to Shakespeare 42
JAMES LYNCH

The Claudius Cover-up: A Psychology of Politics in *Hamlet* 45
DANIEL R. BRONSON

Texans Write 47
F. ALLEN BRIGGS

Stephen Crane's Use of Animal Imagery in "The Blue Hotel" 48
J. F. PEIRCE

Member NCTE Information Exchange Agreement

ENGLISH IN TEXAS is the official journal of the Texas Joint Council of Teachers of English, affiliate of NCTE. The views expressed are the contributor's own and are not necessarily those of the publishers or the editors. All manuscripts and correspondence about the publication should be addressed to Zenobia Verner, C & I, University of Houston, Houston, Texas 77004.

ENGLISH IN TEXAS is published quarterly by the Texas Joint Council of Teachers of English and the University of Houston. Payment of membership fee of $5.00 entitles members to all regular Council publications. Libraries may subscribe at the rate of $5.00 per year. Students studying to become teachers of English are offered a reduced rate of $2.50 per year if the application is accompanied by an instructor's signature. Single copies are available for $1.00 each while supply lasts. Send membership applications and fees to TJCTE Executive Secretary.

Copyright 1977
Texas Joint Council of Teachers of English

SIN, SALVATION AND GRACE in The Scarlet Letter

James E. Barcus

In an analysis of the theology of *The Scarlet Letter,* the critic must never forget that this novel, although theologically oriented, is not a theological treatise. A study of the theological imagery in Hawthorne's masterpiece, however, reveals that while Hawthorne uses Christian images, their function and meaning is contrary to orthodox Christian tradition and to Calvinistic theology. Although Hawthorne assigns traditional symbols to Pearl, Hester, and Dimmesdale, in his conclusions about sin, grace, and redemption, he replaces the work and person of Christ Jesus with a humanistic view of redemption. In his words, "Be true! Be true! Show freely to the world, if not your worst, then some trait whereby the worst may be inferred."[1] Thus, in Hawthorne's theology, man is not saved from his sin, but by his sin.

Hawthorne's preoccupation with sin is familiar to even the most casual reader, but the peculiar value that Hawthorne assigns to sin is less well-known. Pearl, the product of Hester's and Arthur's passion, is sin. We are told that her elements are in disorder, and she is "an imp of evil, emblem and product of sin."[2] Hester is appalled to find in Pearl "a shadowy reflection of the evil that existed in herself."[3] Later Hawthorne says that Pearl "was the scarlet letter in another form; the scarlet letter endowed with life."[4] Moreover, Hester lavishes "many hours of morbid ingenuity, to create an analogy between the object of her affection and the emblem of her guilt and torture. But in truth, Pearl was the one, as well as the other."[5] Pearl is also an angel of judgment, punishing the sins of the rising generation, and as Hester cries to the Governor, ". . . she is the scarlet letter, only capable of being loved, and so endowed with a millionfold the power of retribution for my sin."[6]

But Pearl is more than sin, for the symbols that Hawthorne assigns to her are those that Herbert, Vaughan, and Donne, like other writers in the Christian tradition, assigned to Christ. When Hawthorne claims that all her elements are in disorder, he also tells us that Pearl is perfect.[7] Like the kingdom of heaven, Pearl is purchased only by a great price. She is also a rose, another symbol of Christ.[8] When visiting at the Governor's mansion, she demands a rose from the garden, and when the godly gentleman asks her where she came from, she replies that she "had been plucked by her mother off the bush of wild roses that grew by the prison door."[9] When Pearl tells Mr. Wilson that her name is Pearl, he replies, "Pearl?—Ruby, rather!—or Coral!—or Red Rose at the very least, judging from thy hue!"[10] Hawthorne also compares Hester standing on the scaffold clutching Pearl to the Madonna and Child, and when Pearl wanders in the woods, she becomes a lamb among wolves, plucking the partridge berries which hang like great drops of blood. Thus, from the imagery surrounding Pearl we see that while she typifies the sins of adultery and pride, she also represents the Grace of God. The child in Hester's arms is thus, from one point of view, the confounding evidence of her guilt. From another, the child is the innocent hope of future redemption.

If Pearl is thus both sin and grace, her relationship to Chillingworth, Dimmesdale, and Hester, Hawthorne's primary sinners, should reveal his plan of redemption. Throughout the book, Pearl hates Chillingworth and refuses to have anything to do with him. In Hawthorne's terms this relationship is natural, for Chillingworth, although a sinner, can never be redeemed, for he has committed the Unpardonable Sin, invasion of the sanctity of the human heart. Arthur comments to Hester, "We are not, Hester, the worst sinners in the world . . . He has violated, in cold blood the sanctity of the human heart."[11]

Arthur Dimmesdale's life, however, presents a different conclusion. He knows that he has sinned and then compounded sin upon sin. In efforts to expatiate his sin, he scourges himself; he keeps vigils to search his inner self; and he undergoes the mock-penitence of standing on the scaffold. He admits the ineffectiveness of good works and the vileness of false confession. After planning his and Hester's escape from the colony, he returns to the community a "lost and desperate man,"[12] and he nearly succumbs to sins of the intellect, of the flesh, and of social pressure. Hawthorne says, "Tempted by a dream of happiness, he had yielded himself, with deliberate choice, as he had never done before, to what he knew was deadly sin. And the infectious poison of that sin had been thus rapidly diffused throughout his moral system."[13]

What then must Arthur do to redeem himself? Hawthorne says Arthur must openly acknowledge and accept the particular individual sin which is deservedly his. This true confession is symbolized by Pearl, who is both sin and grace. Whenever Arthur takes Pearl's hand, he receives new life. "The moment that he did so, there came what seemed a tumultuous rush of new life, other life than his own pouring like a torrent into his heart, and hurrying through all his veins."[14] Pearl, on several occasions asks him to take her hand, and queries her mother why he does not do so consistently, and finally Dimmesdale tells her that he will hold her hand on Judgment Day (when all sin will be revealed). But Arthur does redeem himself when he admits his fatherhood and sin by taking Pearl's hand before the gathered community, when he shows freely to the world, if not his worst, yet some trait whereby the worst may be inferred.

If Chillingworth dies unregenerated and Arthur dies regenerated, what is Hester's spiritual condition in Hawthorne's terms? Hester is neither redeemed nor impossible to be redeemed, for she is still in the process of being saved. When her sin was first found out, Hester defied the community by embroidering the letter to call attention to her sin, but gradually the impact of the meaning of the letter comes to her. She is told that the scarlet letter is "an open ignominy, that thereby thou mayst work out an open triumph over the evil within thee, and the sorrow without."[15] Later Hawthorne says, "What she compelled herself to believe . . . was half a truth, and half a self-delusion. Here . . . had been the scene of her guilt, and here should be the scene of her earthly punishment; and so, perchance, the torture of her daily shame would at length purge her soul. . . ."[16]

Although she refuses to repent for her sin, the scarlet letter has a peculiar effect on her and others. She gains a secret sympathy for the sin in others; she accepts the penance of having Pearl bombard the letter with flowers; she finds partial social acceptance among those who had reviled her earlier. In addition, the scarlet letter itself begins to take on other meanings besides sin. "It was nonetheless a fact, however, that, in the eyes of the very men who spoke thus, the scarlet letter had the effect of the cross on a nun's bosom."[17]

Among the most significant passages in the novel dealing with Hawthorne's theology is the interview in the woods between Hester and Arthur. Both admit that they have not found a peace, and that good works are ineffectual. But Dimmesdale knows what is necessary for salvation, for he tells her, "Happy are you, Hester, that wear the scarlet letter openly upon your bosom,"[18] and he maintains that it would be a relief "to look into an eye that recognizes me for what I am."[19] Hester, however, flings the emblem of her sin away, but it misses the brook (which symbolizes time, life and perhaps the purification of baptism), and the scarlet letter lies on the bank until Pearl arrives and forces Hester to reassume the mark of her guilt. Thus this act prefigures the last picture Hawthorne gives of her in the novel, for while we are not assured that she has been redeemed, she does return of her free will to the scene of her sin where she wears the scarlet letter, and thus Hester, too, shows freely to the world, if not her worst, yet some trait whereby the worst may be inferred.

From this analysis, we see that while Hawthorne's theology uses the symbols and terminology of the Calvinistic theology of the Puritans, he puts these symbols to an entirely different use. Whereas Jonathan Edwards extolled the work, the beauty, the magnificence of Christ in His death on the cross and the salvation available for the repentent sinner in this completed act, Hawthorne, deeply conscious of the universal depravity, if not the total depravity of man, claims in *The Scarlet Letter* that man redeems himself by taking on himself his own sin. Thus, man is not saved from his sin, but by his sin. □

Footnotes

[1] Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Scarlet Letter* (New York, 1926), p. 298.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 104.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 105.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 114.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 114.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 127.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 100.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 53.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 126.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 123.
[11] Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Scarlet Letter* (New York, 1926), p. 224.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 252.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 255.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 174.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 74.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 90.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 185.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 220.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 220.

• James E. Barcus is chairman of the Department of English and Speech at Houghton College, Houghton, New York.

"THE ROAD NOT TAKEN" a study in ambiguity

John J. Pollock

Even people who "don't read poetry" are generally familiar with Robert Frost's "The Road Not Taken." The poem, in fact, has become something of a classic, and it is a rare student indeed who can pass from "1" through "12" without encountering it in at least one English class. Unfortunately, however, the usual classroom approach to the poem often goes something like this: "Robert Frost was a great poet. Great poets lead extraordinary lives. Therefore, the speaker of the poem is celebrating his wise decision as a young man to become a poet rather than an insurance adjuster for Mutual of Omaha." The critics, of course, have added a few, somewhat more subtle variations to the theme (noting, for instance, the possibility that the conclusion of the poem is slightly ironic); but by and large they have accepted without question the basic assumption that the poem is about a man who chooses to follow the less traveled

path through life. There are, however, enough ambiguities in the poem to suggest a totally different reading, and thus the poem as a whole can be used as an excellent case study for teachers who wish to introduce their students to the use of ambiguity as an important poetic device.

As the poem begins, the persona states that two roads presented themselves to him; one "bent in the undergrowth," while the other—the one the persona chose—was "grassy and wanted wear."[1] Considering these descriptions alone, the chosen road could be in reality the *more* traveled of the two, not the less traveled, as is usually assumed. Although the chosen road lacks signs of wear and was chosen partly for that reason, it is merely "grassy"; the other is associated rather vaguely with "undergrowth," raising the possibility that it too lacks signs of wear, that it is actually more rugged, possibly slightly overgrown, and thus less traveled. The speaker says he "took the one less traveled by," which at first glance suggests he took the less popular road. But the phrase "traveled by" is ambiguous; since it can mean "bypassed," the road "less traveled by" may be the more popular road, the one fewer people have bypassed. The statement "I kept the first for another day!" merely adds to the ambiguity. Does the speaker mean he postponed taking the first road, or does he mean he kept on walking along the first road ("kept the road," as we say) for another day? As previous critics of the poem have pointed out, Frost goes to some length to emphasize, not the difference between the two roads, but their similarity. One is "just as fair" as the other, and apparently each has borne about the same amount of traffic. The traveler at this juncture, then, presumably could have mistaken the more traveled road for the less traveled one and thus, even with the intention of seeking the more unusual route, finds himself on the more common one.

With these ambiguities in mind, how are we to interpret the final statement, "And that has made all the difference"? Again at first glance, this appears to be the speaker's exclamation that his having followed the more unusual road in the end will greatly enhance his life, though R. G. Malbone, taking the entire poem as essentially humorous, has suggested that the speaker is ironically poking fun at himself in that "what was really a very slight difference will be interpreted later as a clear and decisive difference . . . ."[2] The fact that the speaker will be telling all of this "with a sigh" appears to indicate simply his anticipation of a minor disappointment that he also could not have enjoyed traveling the more conventional road. However, the final statement may be more heavily ironic than Malbone realized. If the speaker, unintentionally or otherwise, chose the more traveled road, he may be expressing his regret at having passed up more interesting possibilities. Or the irony may be more complex yet. Since the roads are quite similar to one another, and since there is no concrete evidence anywhere in the poem to indicate that choosing one road over the other would really make much difference, the final statement may reveal the persona's sardonic recognition of the absurdity of all of life's more or less thoughtful decisions. Faced with the inevitability and finality of death ("I doubted if I should ever come back"), Frost very well may be asking what difference it makes how one has lived one's life.

Lionel Trilling, speaking at a dinner party on the occasion of Frost's eighty-fifth birthday, remarked, "I think of Frost as a terrifying poet. . . . The universe that he conceives is a terrifying universe."[3] After such a strong statement by such a sensitive critic, I think we ought to consider carefully before dismissing "The Road Not Taken" as a poem that "has no serious message," as at least two readers of the poem have publicly asserted.[4] The "message" here—if we must use that unfortunate term—may be that, although the life of the artist (or explorer or social rebel or whatever) may *appear* extraordinary, from the artist's private viewpoint it may be sadly otherwise. The teacher who can convey this idea to his class, then, will have gone a long way in demonstrating how powerful a tool ambiguity can be in the hands of a skillful poet. □

Footnotes

[1] From "The Road Not Taken" from *The Poetry of Robert Frost* edited by Edward Connery Lathem. Copyright 1916, (c) 1969 by Holt, Rinehart and Winston. Copyright 1944 by Robert Frost. Reprinted by permission of Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Publishers.

[2] "Frost's 'The Road Not Taken,'" *Explicator*, 24 (1965), item 27.

[3] "A Speech on Robert Frost: A Cultural Episode," *Poetry Review*, 26 (1959), 451.

[4] See Earl R. Daniels, *The Art of Reading Poetry* (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1941), pp. 347-49; and Ben W. Griffith, Jr., "Frost's 'The Road Not Taken,'" *Explicator*, 12 (1953), item 55.

• John J. Pollock teaches literature and composition at San Jose University in California.

Book Reviews Needed

See details in the column

TEXANS WRITE

Contact
F. Allen Briggs
Box 537
Laredo, Texas 78040

IN SEARCH OF SHAKESPEARE
the essential years

J. F. Peirce

In the *First Folio,* Ben Jonson says of Shakespeare: "He was not of an age, but for all time." Despite this, we know little of Shakespeare the man. After 300 years of scholarship we possess but a handful of facts about his life. A gap of seven years, from 1585 to 1592, remains for which there is no record. About these lost years, when Shakespeare was between the ages of 21 to 28, we know nothing. As Harrison says: "The essential years, when most men collect their experiences, are missing."[1]

I would extend the essential years to include all of the first twenty-eight years of Shakespeare's life. For he doubtless observed the macrocosm in the microcosm of his own large family as well as in that of a closely-knit small town.

The little that we know about Shakespeare's life is from church and court records or at third or fourth hand. He was christened on April 26, 1564. A marriage license was recorded as being issued to "wm Shaxpere at Anna whateley de Temple grafton"[2] on November 27, 1582. The next day, Fulk Sandells and John Richardson put up a surety bond for the marriage of "willm Shagspere" to "Anne hathwey of Stratford."[3] Six months later, on May 26, 1583, a daughter, Susanna, was christened, and the twins, Hamnet and Judith, were christened on February 2, 1585. In 1587, Shakespeare was named a concerned party in litigation over his mother's inheritance. And in 1592, in *A Groatsworth of Wit Bought with a Million of Repentance,* he was attacked by Robert Greene. These are the facts. Everything else that we "know" about Shakespeare's first twenty-eight years is from sources published after his death.

What forces shaped Shakespeare's life? Why did he leave Stratford? When did he leave? Where did he go? What did he do? The answers to these questions remain a matter for conjecture. It is doubtful that any hard evidence will be uncovered now to fill in the details.

Certainly we cannot rely on internal evidence from the plays to tell us what Shakespeare was doing during the essential years. It can be used to prove some things but not others. For example, it cannot prove what Shakespeare was doing during the seven lost years. Because he wrote well about war and the sea does not make him a soldier or a sailor. It probably means that he copied from good sources, was a keen observer, and had a superior imagination and a great gift for language.

In 1872, Blades listed nineteen occupations—including skewer-sharpener, mad doctor, and prophet—that scholars, using "internal evidence," concluded that Shakespeare was engaged in during the seven lost years.[4] How many *other* occupations have they put his hand to since?

Only careful analysis of the few facts that we know about Shakespeare and his family can indicate the influences that shaped him during the essential years. Unquestionably, the rapid rise and fall of his father's fortunes influenced him greatly.

John Shakespeare was born and brought up in Snitterfield, near Stratford, on one of Robert Arden's supernumerary farms. The first recorded date of his living in Stratford is April 29, 1552, when along with Adrian Quiney he was fined for accumulating an unauthorized dunghill.

In 1557, he married Mary Arden, daughter of Robert Arden. And that year he began public service, being appointed an aletaster. He was commissioned a petty constable in 1558, appointed an affeeror in the leet-court in 1559, and elected a borough chamberlain of the Stratford Corporation in 1561 and 1562.

In 1564, his first son, the third of eight recorded children, was born and christened Gulielmus, or William.

In 1565, John Shakespeare was listed among the capital burgesses of Stratford and recorded as giving money for relief of victims of the plague. That year he was appointed an alderman. In 1568, he was elected bailiff, the highest town office, and in 1571, chief alderman.

In 1576, John Shakespeare applied to the College of Heralds for a grant of arms, but none was issued. This is strange considering his public service, his success in business, and his wife's family's armorial bearings.

That he was successful in business can perhaps best be judged by his diverse interests and rapid acquisition of houses and land. Aubrey says that he was a butcher. Rowe says that he was a wool dealer. And Chambers says that various documents show that he was a glover and yeoman and dealt in agricultural produce.[5]

Beginning in 1577, his fortunes mysteriously declined, and he was increasingly cited for debt. In 1580, he was fined for failing to give security against a breach of the peace. In 1586, he was ejected from the Stratford Corporation for nonattendance of meetings. And in 1592, he was cited for failing to attend monthly church meetings as required by law, probably for fear of being arrested for debt.

Why did he experience such sudden financial

reverses? What caused him to drop out of public affairs? For ten years after September 5, 1576, he attended only one meeting of the town Council until the Council chose another alderman to fill his place in 1586. Chute says that the Council dropped him from its membership with reluctance and that "A further evidence of their regard for him is shown by the fact that an alderman was normally fined if he stayed away from meetings, and during those ten years of absence . . . (he) was never fined."[6] Chute adds that it is curious that John Shakespeare did not "have to part with the three houses he owned on Henley Street"[7] because of his debts.

Chambers says that in 1577 John Shakespeare "became irregular in his contribution to town levies, and had to give a mortgage on property of his wife at Wilmcote as security for a loan from his brother-in-law, . . . Money was raised to pay this off, partly by the sale of a small interest in land at Snitterfield . . . partly perhaps by that of the Greenhill street house and other property in Stratford outside Henley street, none of which seems to have ever come into William Shakespeare's hands."[8]

Why didn't John Shakespeare sell off more of his property and get out of debt? I believe that he was "house proud and land poor." He resembles many modern-day businessmen who become involved in too many projects too quickly and overextend both themselves and their credit, ending in financial ruin and social embarrassment. This is undoubtedly what happened to him. He bought too many houses and too much land too quickly and spread himself and his resources too thin trying to engage in too many businesses at the same time. How could he not fail?

In counterpoint to the rise and fall of his financial fortunes was his attempt to keep up with the Ardens and the Quineys. Quennel says that he could not pretend to be a gentlemen "since he had inherited no armorial bearings," whereas his wife's "ancestors included a sheriff of Warwickshire" and her "maiden name recalled the ancient forest lying to the north and west of Stratford."[9] No doubt he had envied his wife's family from early youth when he grew up on one of the Arden tenant farms.

Chute says that "The darkening of John Shakespeare's life . . . is all the more noticeable in contrast to the increasing brilliance of Adrian Quiney's. The Shakespeares and the Quineys had known each other since . . . Snitterfield, and when John Shakespeare came to live on Henley Street, Adrian Quiney was one of his close neighbors."[10]

Adrian was older than John, and he had started his political climb earlier. Chute says that Quiney was "High Bailiff the year John was made affeeror, and the year that John himself was elected Bailiff, Adrian . . . went up with him to London on borough business . . . The two friends evidently worked harmoniously together and for a time their careers were almost parallel."[11]

In 1576 John Shakespeare applied for a coat of arms. At the time, Adrian Quiney was already a member of the gentry. The coat of arms did not come to John Shakespeare, and shortly thereafter he began to suffer financial reverses, while the fortunes of the Quineys continued to prosper. It is not surprising then that because of his mounting debts, his embarrassment, his anger, and his frustration over failing to receive a grant of arms he did not continue to attend meetings of the Council.

After William Shakespeare became a successful playwright, John, no doubt at his son's urging, resubmitted his request for a coat of arms, and on October 20, 1596, the grant was issued. But when he later requested that his wife's arms be impaled upon his, the request was denied.

It is interesting to note that once William Shakespeare became a success, he began buying houses and land like his father. Chute says that "By 1598 . . . (he) had become one of the major householders in Stratford, but . . . (that he) never showed any interest in the welfare of the town or how its affairs were conducted. . . . (His) chief activity in Stratford, apart from the growing number of his real estate purchases, seems to have been in lawsuits with fellow townsmen over debts. . . . He was deeply interested in the fortunes of the Shakespeare family but not in the fortunes of Stratford."[12] There is a suggestion of vengeance in his attitude.

Among his purchases was New Place, the second largest house in Stratford, built by Sir Hugh Clopton, onetime Lord Mayor of London. Chute says that "New Place was much more than just a house. It was a symbol of high social standing in Stratford and its owner had a special pew in church."[13] In other words, it was a status symbol. Shakespeare was obviously trying not only to keep up with the Quineys but to surpass them.

At the time that his father's fortunes began to fail, Shakespeare was thirteen, and when he was not in school, he was no doubt pressed into service in one of his father's businesses. He was eighteen and apprenticed to his father as a butcher or a woolsman at the time of his marriage.

The circumstances surrounding his marriage are confused to say the least. On November 27, 1582, a marriage license was issued in Worcester to "wm Shaxpere et Anna whateley de Temple grafton," five miles from Stratford. The license has been lost, and no record exists of his marriage.

The next day, Fulk Sandells and John Richardson put up a bond guaranteeing the legal marriage of "willm Shagspere" to Anne hathwey of Stratford." The only other record of Sandells and Richardson is as supervisor and witness, respectively, in the will of Richard Hathaway of Shottery, who had a daughter Agnes. Chambers says that Joseph Green has traced Anne Hathaway to Shottery and that "Various small trains of evidence point to her identification with the daughter Agnes mentioned in the will . . . Agnes was legally a distinct name from Anne, but there can be no doubt that . . . custom treated them as identical."[14]

Most authorities support a scribal error to explain the difference between the names "Anna whateley" and "Anne hathwey," and Shakespeare's name is given as "wm Shaxpere" on the license register and as "willm Shagspere" in the bond. However, the added discrepancies of "Anne" and "Anna" for *Agnes* and of "Temple grafton" and "Stratford" for *Shottery* leaves this matter open for debate.

Somo suggest that the marriage could have been performed in Temple Grafton, but only the "shotgun" aspect of the affair would tend to support this. Shakespeare was underage and Anne was eight years older and three-months pregnant. Apologists suggest a pre-marriage contract to excuse her pregnancy, but there is no evidence of such an arrangement.

Almost nothing has been made of the fact that *Whateley* was a well-known name in Stratford. George Whateley was on the Stratford Council at the same time that John Shakespeare was a member. Thus Shakespeare would have been acquainted with the Whateleys and through them the Temple-Grafton Whateleys *if* there was such a branch of the family. But unless further evidence is uncovered, one cannot safely assume that "Anna whateley of Temple grafton," "Anne hathwey of Stratford," and "Agnes hathwey of Shottery" are one and the same.

Further complicating the issue is Chambers' statement that the Hathaways "were distinguished by the *alias* Gardiner, Gardener, Gardner, or Garner,"[15] but he gives no reason for their use of an alias. Could there be a possible relationship between the Hathaway-Gardiners of Shottery and William Gardiner, the Surrey justice, whom Hotson, in *Shakespeare versus Shallow,* identifies as the prototype for Shallow?

A point on which I have found no comment is the possible relationship between John Shakespeare's attendance at the Council meeting of September 5, 1582, and the subsequent registration of his son's marriage license on November 27th and the bond on the 28th. Why would John Shakespeare suddenly attend *one* meeting of the town Council after an absence of six years, then not attend another meeting for the next four, after which he was dropped for non-attendance?

Six months after Shakespeare's marriage a daughter was born. Twenty months later, Anne Shakespeare gave birth to twins. Since Shakespeare recognized the twins, he must have been in Stratford in April 1584 at the time of their conception, but he could have left any time thereafter. For he need not have been present at their christening in 1585 or in 1587 when he was named a concerned party in litigation over his mother's inheritance.

Why did Shakespeare leave Stratford? Chute says: "In a general way it might be said that Shakespeare's reason for leaving Stratford was the same as his father's for having left Snitterfield: the place was too small for him. The same thing was happening all over England, with the young men leaving the villages for the towns and the towns for the great city of London."[16]

The popular traditions are (1) that he fled Stratford for fear of prosecution for poaching, (2) that he was a teacher in the country, and (3) that he left with one of the actors companies that played in Stratford between 1585 and 1587.

The tradition that he fled for fear of prosecution for poaching deer on the estate of Sir Thomas Lucy at Charlecote has for its source a friend of the Rev. Richard Davies of Gloucestershire, who embroidered the story before his death in 1708. Chute says that Davies did not know that the Lucys "did not have a deer park in the sixteenth century."[17] This does not preclude that Shakespeare might have gotten in trouble for poaching other game, however.

That he was a teacher in the country is based on Aubrey's haphazard questioning of William Beeston, son of an actor contemporary with Shakespeare. Aubrey was born ten years after Shakespeare's death, and Beeston was an old man when Aubrey questioned him. Following is Aubrey's memorandum: "Though as Ben: Jonson sayes of him, that he had but little Latine and lesse Greek, He understood Latine pretty well: for he had been in his younger yeares a Schoolmaster in the Countrey."[18]

This conflicts with Rowe's statement that John Shakespeare could give his eldest son "no better Education than his Employment. He had bred him, 'tis true, for some time at a Free-School, where 'tis probable he acquir'd that little *Latin* he was Master of: But the narrowness of his Circumstances, and the want of his assistance at Home, forc'd his Father to withdraw him thence, and unhappily prevented his further Proficiency in that Language."[19] Like many of the statements in Rowe's 1709 biography, this statement is no doubt erroneous.

McManaway says that Stratford "was blessed with a good grammar school . . . (and that) Thomas Jenkins . . . who was master . . . the years when young William should have been in the upper school, was fellow scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, B.A. . . . M.A. . . . (and that) A high-school principal of equivalent education today would be a Ph.D. of Harvard."[20]

Chute says it is doubtful that Shakespeare could have been a schoolmaster since they were strictly licensed at the time and usually required to have university training.[21]

Another tradition, reported by Dr. Johnson, whose source is said to have been D'Avenant, has Shakespeare holding horses at playhouse doors. Chute says that Malone was the first to debunk both the deer-stealing and horse-holding traditions.[22]

I believe that Shakespeare left Stratford for a number of reasons: his father's reduced circumstances, the stultifying effect of menial employment on one of his intelligence, the unhappiness of his forced marriage, and the distraction of young children constantly underfoot.

His marriage was no doubt a marriage of convenience for Anne and of inconvenience for him. As was the custom of the time, he probably took his wife to his father's house, which was already crowded with his brothers and sisters, and which quickly became even more crowded with his own three children. No doubt he decided that he was too young to be a husband and a father *except* in name and that there was no future for him in Stratford.

Looking about for a means of escape, he must have found it in one of the seventeen or more acting companies that visited Stratford from 1568 to 1587, when he was between the ages of four to 23.[23] Doubtless the plays that he saw stimulated his imagination and aroused his interest in becoming a part of the theater.

Chute says that when an acting company arrived in Stratford, its members presented their credentials to the high bailiff so that they could be licensed to perform and that the first show was put on before the bailiff and the other members of the Council. He says that "Admission . . . was evidently free . . . since the Council was paying the bill, and there was always an enthusiastic attendance."[24] Shakespeare undoubtedly attended these plays, and when his father was high bailiff, he must have gotten to meet and know the players.

Chambers says that "Malone thought . . . (Shakespeare) might have left Stratford with one of the travelling companies" and that "Later biographers have fixed upon Leicester's men, who were in Stratford in 1586-87,"[25] as the company with which he left. This seems a natural choice, as the company performed in Stratford on at least three occasions,[26] and it was the company he was later known to be with. James Burbage was a principal member, and Shakespeare had a close association with his son Richard, the great tragic actor who created many of his heroes.

To become a successful playwright requires a long apprenticeship. Therefore it seems logical that Shakespeare must have joined an acting company as it traveled in the country. Undoubtedly he must have spent at least five or more years learning about acting, staging, and writing plays to be able to achieve the success that aroused Greene's jealousy. No doubt he held the prompt book, tired the actors, performed bit parts, and rewrote scenes from old plays as well as entire plays before writing plays of his own.

Greene, addressing Marlowe, Nashe, and Peele in *A Groatsworth of Wit* in 1592, refers to Shakespeare as "an upstart Crow, Beautified with our feathers, that with his *Tygers hart wrapt in a Players hyde*, supposes he is as well able to bombast out a blanke verse as the best of you: and being an absolute *Iohannes fac totum*, is in his owne conceit the only Shake-scene in the Countrey."[27]

Unquestionably, this quotation refers to Shakespeare's use of material from a play by Greene and Marlowe about Henry VI, which Shakespeare incorporated in *The True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York*, later *Henry VI, Part III*. No doubt what aroused Greene's ire was the fact that Shakespeare achieved success by his skillful use of Greene's material, and there was nothing he could do about it, there being no copyright law at the time.

The belief held by some that Greene's attack is against Shakespeare as an actor has no basis. Shakespeare was acting only minor roles at the time. Baldwin lists Shakespeare as playing such parts as the Duke in *Love's Labor's Won*, Antonio in *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Escalus in *Romeo and Juliet*, and the Ghost in *Hamlet* between 1588 and 1593.[28]

The fact that Greene refers to Shakespeare as "Shake-scene" in *A Groatsworth of Wit* indicates that he was well enough known that Greene expected his readers to catch the pun. They were also expected to recognize that *"Tygers hart wrapt in a Player's hyde"* is a play upon "O tiger's heart wrapp'd in a woman's hide,"[29] a popular line from *The True Tragedy*. And the reference to Shakespeare as an *"Iohannes fac totum,"* or jack-of-all-trades, indicates that Shakespeare was already an all-round man of the theater.

Chettle, who published Greene's pamphlet posthumously, inserted an apology in his own *Kind Hartes Dreame* later that year, saying that various men of high social position had "reported, . . . (Shakespeare's) vprightness of dealing, which argues his honesty, and his facetious grace in writing, that aprroues his Art."[30] Obviously, then, Shakespeare was already recognized as a writer and he had been in London long enough to acquire friends who were powerful enough to force Chettle's apology.

From the foregoing, it is apparent that Shakespeare had human weaknesses, passions, and vanities like the rest of us. Perhaps they are what enabled him to write so humanly of this, our world. Apologists have tried to make him to be an angel, but because he wrote like an angel does not mean that he lived like one. He was a man, not of an age, but for all seasons, one who through the focus of his imagination and with a sun-bright gift of language was able to illuminate and magnify his weaknesses, passions, and vanities to suggest both the sins and virtues of gods and kings. □

Notes

[1] G. B. Harrison, *Introducing Shakespeare* (New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1947), p. 14.
[2] *The Riverside Shakespeare*, ed. by G. Blakemore Evans (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1974), p. 1829.
[3] *The Riverside Shakespeare*, p. 1829.
[4] William Blades, *Shakspere and Typography*, London, 1872, reprinted (New York: Burt Franklin, 1969), pp. 3-17.
[5] E. K. Chambers, "William Shakespeare," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., 1952), Vol. 20, p. 434.
[6] Marchette Chute, *Shakespeare of London* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Co. Inc., 1949), p. 47.
[7] Chute, p. 47.
[8] Chambers, "William Shakespeare," p. 435.
[9] Peter Quennel, *Shakespeare, A Biography* (Cleveland and New York: The World Publishing Co., 1963), pp. 17-18.
[10] Chute, pp. 47-48.
[11] Chute, p. 48.
[12] Chute, p. 188.
[13] Chute, pp. 186-187.
[14] Chambers, "William Shakespeare," p. 435.
[15] E. K. Chambers, *William Shakespeare: A Study of Facts and Problems* (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1930), Vol. II, p. 48.
[16] Chute, p. 55.
[17] Chute, p. 352.
[18] Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, Vol. II, p. 254.
[19] Chambers, *William Shakespeare*, Vol. II, p. 264.
[20] James G. McManaway, *The Authorship of Shakespeare* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1962), p. 12.
[21] Chute, p. 349.
[22] Chute, p. 354.
[23] *The Riverside Shakespeare*, pp. 1860-1870.
[24] Chute, p. 22.
[25] Chambers, "William Shakespeare," p. 435.
[26] *The Riverside Shakespeare*, pp. 1862-1868.
[27] *The Riverside Shakespeare*, p. 1835.
[28] Thomas Whitfield Baldwin, *The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1927), table following p. 226.
[29] *The Riverside Shakespeare*, p. 1835.
[30] *The Riverside Shakespeare*, pp. 1835-1836.

• J. F. Peirce teaches English at Texas A&M University.

RIGHT DEEDS FOR WRONG REASONS: teaching the Bible as literature

James E. Barcus

Having encountered four tempters, Thomas, the hero of T. S. Eliot's *Murder in the Cathedral*, reflects, "The last temptation is the greatest treason/ To do the right deed for the wrong reason." The study of the Bible as literature is fraught, especially today, with the same peril. The Supreme Court ruling on prayer and Bible reading in public schools and the growing secularization of Western culture have led concerned parents and teachers into questionable practices, all the way from rock-slinging in West Virginia to the employment of a variety of ruses to introduce the study of the Bible into the public schools. Clearly the end, in this case the study of the Bible for the moral and devotional edification of children, does not justify any means. Therefore, parent pressure groups and well-motivated teachers ought to examine closely their motives and methods.

Still, there are reasons, sound academic and intellectual reasons, for studying the Bible as literature. But we ought to be very frank about these reasons and also about the dangers and pitfalls inherent in the study of the Bible in the classroom. In the first place, we often err by making extravagant claims for the literary quality of Holy Scripture. While it is true, for example, that perhaps one-third of the Bible is poetry, not all of that poetry ranks with the best of the world's culture. In addition, much of the Bible is a compilation of oral history, legal records, genealogies, and rewritings of earlier texts which are now lost to us.

Much of this compilation is not literary in any sense of the word, however edifying the seemingly endless series of "begats" may be from a spiritual perspective. Finally, attempts to interest students in parables and some of the shorter Old Testament books by calling them short stories will not withstand the scrutiny of either Biblical or literary scholarship.

Before beginning the study of the Bible as literature, another problem must be resolved—the problem of the text. The paradoxical fact is that while the King James version influenced English literature from the later Renaissance to the twentieth century, it does not reflect the variety of literary styles found in the original manuscripts. While its beauty is indisputable, the differences between, for example, the Gospels of Luke and John are obscured. Even the genealogies, like Milton's lists of pagan gods and goddesses, are sonorous. If we choose this version, we should be aware that it is being studied as an English cultural artifact, not because it reflects accurately the original manuscripts.

Yet the use of the King James version has merit, for as most teachers at any level realize, we are in danger of losing contact with our literary and verbal heritage. The language of Shakespeare, Milton, Thoreau, and even Faulkner is obsolete. For a number of years, Americans who were reared hearing the King James version in home and church could, with some difficulty and the help of a few footnotes, hear, understand, and appreciate *Othello*, *Walden*, and *The Sound and the Fury*. Alas, that is no longer true, even for those Americans who hear the Bible read in church and home.

The plethora of modern translations and the astronomical sales of some of the least accurate paraphrases, especially those employing contemporary idioms, portend a declining appreciation for the rich imagery and the rolling rhythms which characterized English prose and poetry for decades. If there were no other reasons, its continuous and pervasive influence on English literature and language for at least 300 years would justify the study of the King James version.

To speak more particularly about literature, perhaps one of the most fruitful ways to introduce the Bible as literature is through the poetry. Even those readers who may think they dislike poetry will respond, out of familiarity and necessity, to the essentials of poetic imagery and metaphorical thinking. The writers of Scripture consistently employ this essentially human mode of communication. Phrases like "God is my rock and my fortress" and "In the shadow of the Almighty . . .," demonstrate the natural appeal that simile and metaphor have for the human consciousness. Even the all too familiar "I am the Bread of Life" may regain some measure of its original force as Americans learn anew the value of grain and bread. I suspect that "I am the Light of the World" will also gain new immediacy as an energy-short world grows conscious of how that image startled a first-century man who knew only flickering fires and unsteady flames of oil lamps.

The teacher of literature, wishing to introduce students to poetry, cannot go far wrong by introducing these familiar phrases—not as poetry—but as examples of how metaphor is basic to our thinking processes. Precise analysis is not possible in any other way. There is no other way to think, just as there is no other way, except to use the most obvious

cliches such as "loud," to describe voices. A voice may be acid or silvery, round or gray, and the only method of saying what we mean is metaphor. St. John knew this, and his description of the Lord in chapter 3 of Revelations testifies to his awareness of the power and precision of metaphor.

At another level, the poetry of the Old Testament deserves a firmer place in literature classes than it usually has, for many of the poetic passages can take their place among the best of world literature. Although Hebrew poetry employed a form and rules quite unlike the familiar stress and rhyme patterns of English verse, these very differences deserve attention. Parallelism in thought and phonetic rhythm characterizes Hebrew poetry. Since the phonetic rhythm can be communicated properly only in the Hebrew, the thought parallelism is clearest to the English reader.

Although some commentators distinguish five types of parallelism in Hebrew poetry, three will illustrate the form, unity, and balance inherent in Hebrew poetry and the art of most cultures. The three types are synonymous parallelism or repetition, antithetical or contrast parallelism, and constructive or synthetic parallelism. The first, synonymous, occurs in Psalm 46:9 and involves three lines rather than the customary two.

> He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth;
> He breaketh the bow and cutteth the spear in sunder;
> He burneth the chariot in the fire.

The second, antithetical or contrast parallelism, conveys the thought of the first line in negative form. The book of Proverbs contains some of the best examples, as in 15:1.

> A soft answer turns away wrath,
> But grievous words stir up anger.

In constructive parallelism, the poet gives a cumulative effect to the lines by completing the thought of the first line in the second. Psalm 29:1 is an excellent example.

> Give unto the Lord, O ye mighty,
> Give unto the Lord glory and strength

From these few examples, it is clear that much Hebrew poetry deserves close literary analysis in itself, for it is a closely structured form and represents a high cultural development. Since the Psalms are at once familiar in content and strange in form, they are particularly useful as a bridge to the study of non-Western literary traditions.

The wisdom literature of the Proverbs should not be overlooked either, for the patterns, which scholars like R. B. Y. Scott have discovered, reveal basic patterns common to the proverbial wisdom of most cultures. Professor Scott points out that simple patterns underlie these proverbial and gnomic utterances. Comparison and contrast with the adages of *Poor Richard's Almanac* and other folk literature reveal common structures and themes. A typical example is in the formula: Where A is, you will find B also. That structure is common to both "A penny saved is a penny earned" and "Where there is no oxen, there is no grain" (Proverbs 14:4). Analogy (A is like B) is common to both "Like mother, like daughter" and "Like cold water to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country" (Proverbs 22:1).

While Biblical scholars tend to classify the books of Ruth, Esther, Jonah, and Daniel as short stories, that nomenclature is misleading. The fact is that while these books along with other narratives, like the parable of the prodigal son, are fine examples of the art of storytelling. They are not, technically, short stories. They are worth studying, however, for their compression and economy and for their attempt to deal with complex problems. Both Ruth and Esther, for example, tell a swiftly-moving and beautiful story outlining from different perspectives the problems of aliens in a foreign land, a theme which is perennially relevant. While the characters in these stories are not fully developed (not rounded), they are delineated through a store of stock epithets like "fair" and "comely" reminiscent of other folk literature.

Since ancient classical times, rhetoric and the art of persuasion have been thought a necessary part of the educational process, and the study of literary models still constitutes a teaching device in most writing and literature classes. Ironically, some of the best examples of persuasion occur in Scripture and are often overlooked by teachers of rhetoric. Paul's sermon on Mars Hill and Stephen's sermon before the Sanhedrin reveal the essentials of persuasive rhetoric, including audience analysis, a knowledge of culture and history, and the ability to move from the known to the unknown. Much of the book of Romans and Paul's meditations on death in I Corinthians 15 could also be studied profitably as examples of the art of persuasion and rhetoric.

To conclude, the study of the Bible as literature is perilous. On the one hand, as C. S. Lewis noted, the Scriptures are surrounded by so much aura that few non-believers will read them as literature. On the other hand, believers, in a real sense blinded by their faith, also overlook the literary qualities of the Bible. Both may fall into error, the former expecting too little; the latter demanding too much. Between this Scylla and Charybdis lies a rough but rewarding passage into some of the most unappreciated literature in any language. □

• James E. Barcus is chairman of the Department of English and Speech at Houghton College, Houghton, New York.

A SOUTHERN AUTHOR'S FIGHT for international copyright*

Elizabeth Gill

The December *NEA Reporter* lauds the passage of a new copyright law (Public Law 94-553), the first revision of copyright laws since 1909. The new law provides relief for teachers who practice "fair use" of materials in the classroom. Teachers, of all people, should use copyrighted material fairly, and realize that man's ideas and words are as valuable as any technological invention. The laws protecting authors, vital in a fair society, were hard to obtain. A prolific southern author of the nineteenth century, William Gilmore Simms, fought long and hard for an international copyright law.

Simms believed that an international copyright law was of utmost importance to the development of a national literature. He expressed his belief in a letter to George F. Holmes in 1843:

> . . . the attainment of a proper Copyright law is one of the necessary agents in bringing about the awakening of the American public to the importance of a national literature.[1]

Yet not until 1886 was a European Copyright Convention held which provided for reciprocal regulations of copyright among most of the nations of Europe. Although the United States was not a party to this agreement of the Copyright Union, works originating in this country can today be protected in all countries of the union by a special arrangement with Great Britain.[2]

However, protection for American writers was long sought before it was granted. A great number of nineteenth-century writers, especially American, waged a prolonged and fervent campaign for international copyright, particularly during the 1840's.[3] In 1837, George Palmer Putnam organized an international copyright association hoping to influence Congress to take favorable action. Others who joined Putnam in openly favoring such protection for both American and British authors included William Cullen Bryant, Charles Fenno Hoffman, Rufus Griswold, Lewis G. Clark, Nathaniel P. Willis, and Fitz-Greene Halleck. On the other side of the Atlantic, Charles Dickins was quite active and outspoken.[4]

The condition of American literature because of lack of copyright was truly deplorable. Neither British nor American authors were able to profit by their own writings. American publishers were naturally loath to pay American writers, especially unknown ones, when they could get pirated copies of English books without having to pay the authors. The cost of publication being their only cost, they were able to produce these books very cheaply. Few but English authors were read, because publishers sold books by American authors at a much higher rate to make up for what they had to pay the native writers.[5]

The crossing of the Atlantic by rapid steamboat, beginning in 1838, brought popular English books immediately to America and further injured American authors.[6] Simms and other professional writers were severely damaged financially. In 1841, Simms wrote to James H. Hammond:

> . . . my income from literature, which in 1835 was $6000 per annum, is scarce $1500 now, owing to the operation of cheap reprints which pay publishers & printers only and yield the author little or nothing.[7]

Members of Congress were not willing to remedy the situation because they could see no political ends to be gained from such action. In February, 1844, Simms sent a "Memorial to Congress" to his friend George Frederick Holmes, asking him to get subscribers for it and hoping it would please the Copyright Club.[8] The memorial petitioned the Senate and House of Representatives to pass a bill "now, in the interest of Right, of Honor, and National Self-respect," averring that

> . . . the American government, by denying to foreign authors the copy-right of their books, while it is grossly unjust towards them, inflicts an irreparable injury upon its own authors, by compelling them to enter the market under a system of the most disadvantageous competition; and thus fills the channels of circulation with an unpaid and often corrupt foreign literature to the partial exclusion, if not the entire extinction, of all sound and healthful native products.[9]

Yet in October, 1844, Simms despaired of Congressional action, saying—

> The measure still drags on, like a wounded snake, in our national councils; its prospects impaired by two circumstances,—the active hostility of manufacturers, whose interests, it is supposed, such a concession might injuriously affect; and the indifference of our statesmen themselves to any measure to which the public are indifferent.[10]

In his copyright espousal, Simms wrote four open "letters" to I. E. Holmes, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., in January, March, June, and August.

In the first letter Simms reiterated many of the ideas he had often before propounded: the need of a national literature, the "pernicious" influence of

British domination of "our moral and mental character" through literature, and even the desirability of a national dialect to secure "mental independence."[11] The War of 1812, Simms believed, had stirred up a "passion for thorough independence" which led to the adoption of a government system of protection for manufacturers, but not for authors. "The notion seems to have been," declared Simms, "if our bodies are free from foreign dominion, it matters little that our thoughts, our feelings, our souls should still remain in bondage."[12]

Simms' first letter to the *Messenger* used some tables from a pamphlet by George Palmer Putnam, comparing British and American publications. One table showed that in 1834 only nineteen original American novels and tales were published in the United States, while ninety-five British reprints were published. The conclusion of the first letter opened the way for further discussion in the subsequent articles. In introducing the plight of American authors, Simms said:

> American Literature is as suddenly silent as if it never had a voice. Its authors . . . have almost ceased to publish. Some of them, through sheer necessity, are driven to other and less congenial occupations. . . . The inquiry into the cause of this singular and sudden change must be reserved for another communication.[13]

The second article opened with an inquiry as to the reason for the change in the condition of American authorship even though copyright law had remained the same. Simms proceeded to recount with great detail the history of the publishing industry in America which led to the era of "Cheap Literature."

First of all, Simms made clear that native authors had never been adequately rewarded. Many, prior to 1834, were mere amateurs who "contemplated no higher gratification than that of seeing themselves in print." They wrote only in leisure hours as relief from other vocations. The most distinguished American authors may have received from three hundred to three thousand dollars for a copyright, but few ever received more than fifteen hundred. Indeed, "the business was never such as to render it over seductive, to those who had the pecuniary returns very much at heart."[14]

However, the native writers, in spite of many obstacles and lack of encouragement, had begun to create an American taste for literature, and the publishers were swamped with material from new writers. Ignoring the professional authors, these publishers selected at pleasure from the amateurs, because they did not have to pay them well. In addition, foreign supplies, particularly fiction, began to pour in upon the publishers. "It was only in regard to the consumption of this foreign supply that any . . . competition ever took place among American publishers," Simms averred.[15]

This competition for foreign books led to a sort of gentlemen's agreement: "They agreed to poach upon different manors." Yet even then, if he found he had made a poor choice, a publisher might seize upon a book he had accorded his rival. "Finding that they could not always trust one another," the publishers hit upon the idea of paying a paltry sum to the British author for the printed sheets of his work prior to its publication in Great Britain. Even so, pirated editions of the work would be produced in three to five days at a much lower price. And soon the public was trained to wait for the later and less costly edition. Thus, Simms declared, the publishers suffered because their error lay in not seeing how an international copyright law could help them.[16]

According to Simms in the opening of the third letter, he did not mean to press for rights on the British market if he could obtain proper adjustment of claims at home, even though American writings were being republished in England. He said that he had before him some of his own writing which had reached the second edition in London without his having received a cent of compensation. Yet he felt that if the American market could be protected for American authors, they would not worry about British laws. In fact, said Simms, "I prefer that we should act independently in this matter . . . Let England do as she pleases. *Let us do right.*"[17]

Simms insisted that "right" meant giving an author title to the productions of his own head and hands. He contended against "Mr. Justice Yates," who had propounded the most tenable argument opposing copyright. But Simms believed that Yates' use of analogies amounted to faulty reasoning. He also believed that the appeal to long established common law was specious argumentation. After all, it would have been hard for anyone to steal another's mental production before the discovery of printing.[18] Therefore, Simms reasoned, a new law must be developed to cover a new situation.

Yates had claimed that "mere value" did not constitute property. He drew an analogy by saying, "The air, the light, the sun, are of value inestimable, but who can claim a property in them?" Simms replied, ". . . *the Maker* of them—he who at any moment can cease to make!" Similarly, an author can claim right to his literary creations—he has made them.[19]

Literary property was a new kind of property with no laws to protect it because they had not been needed earlier. Until the discovery of the art of printing the author naturally needed no protection by copyright. "The physical difficulties alone were sufficient to prevent the pirating of his writings."[20] The advent of printing caused no alarm, Simms continued in the fourth letter, because the "press of the country did not so much address its labors to the great body of the people."[21] For a long while, printers devoted their time to the publication of the vast literature of the preceding ages. Contemporary dramatists, such as Shakespeare, derived their remunerations from stage productions—the only "publication" that they desired. Shakespeare, indeed published his poems, but with a dedication to the Earl of Southampton, for which he received one thousand pounds, "sufficient reason why the author should not care about Copyright."[22]

Simms urgently appealed to Congress to remedy existing conditions in order to save native authors, for "native authorship is very fairly at an end. The native writer no longer finds entrance to the office of

the publisher. . . ."[23] If, however, a mutual Copyright Law be passed, "hundreds of British writers would be besieging the American publisher," and he would still have ample material to choose from. The native writer, thus placed on the same footing with the foreigner in the area of cost to the publisher, might ever have an advantage, for the publisher might allow "his patriotism to influence" his choice.[24]

What effect Simms's effort to get an international copyright law had would be hard to determine. Suffice it to say, that no such law was passed during Simms's lifetime. Various proposals came before Congress in the 1840's and 1850's, but they were effectually opposed by manufacturing interests. Between 1854 and 1865 no proposals on copyright were even presented in Congress. Piracies continued, with European war books gaining special popularity, both North and South, during the Civil War. But Congress paid little attention to what they must have considered a very minor problem.[25] □

Notes

*From Elizabeth L. Gill, *An Examination of Literary Nationalism in the Letters and Selected Criticism of William Gilmore Simms* (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Houston, 1968).

[1] *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms* with an Introduction by Donald Davidson and biographical sketch by Alexander S. Salley. Vol. I, 1830-1844; Vol. II, 1845-1849; Vol. III, 1850-1857; Vol. IV, 1858-1866; Vol. V, 1867-1870. Hereinafter cited as *Letters*.

[2] Howard Walls, *The Copyright Handbook*, New York: Watson Guptill Publications, 1963, pp. 56-63.

[3] See Aubert J. Clark, *The Movement for International Copyright in Nineteenth Century America*, Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1960.

[4] Benjamin Spencer, *The Quest for Nationality*, Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1957, p. 255.

[5] Parke Godwin, *A Biography of William Cullen Bryant* in two volumes, Vol. I, New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1883, p. 316.

[6] C. Hugh Holman, *Introduction to Views and Reviews in American Literature, History and Fiction*, First Series by William Gilmore Simms, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1962, p. xx.

[7] *Letters*, II, 385.

[8] *Letters*, I, 402.

[9] *Letters*, I, 402.

[10] "Writings of Cornelius Mathews," *Southern Quarterly Review*, VI (October, 1844), 315.

[11] "International Copyright Law," *Southern Literary Messenger*, X (January, 1844), 7-9. Hereinafter cited as *S.L.M.*

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 11-12.

[13] "International Copyright Law," *S.L.M.*, X (January, 1844), 17.

[14] "International Copyright," *S.L.M.*, X (March, 1844), 137-138.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 138.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 138-139.

[17] "International Copyright," *S.L.M.*, X (June, 1844), 340.

[18] *Ibid.*, pp. 342-343.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 345.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 348.

[21] "International Copyright," *S.L.M.*, X (August, 1844), 449.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 450.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 458.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 465.

[25] Aubert J. Clark, pp. 83-84.

• Mrs. Gill teaches high school English at Barbers Hill High School, Mont Belvieu.

Invitation to Participate In Two Pilot Projects of TJCTE

One of the things the Council should be doing is helping to provide Texas oriented teaching materials for Texas language teachers. It has been agreed that two of these areas will be investigated during the year 1977-78. The pilot attempts in the projects will be displayed at the 1978 Convention in San Antonio, and if the ideas seem fruitful, it is expected that the Council will adopt one or both as official projects of the group. If they become official projects, some basic funding may be provided; for the pilot season, the first attempts will be the entire responsibility of the persons who volunteer to attempt them.

Project on Texas Authors: The proposal is to create a number of slide-tape interviews with various authors living in Texas. The idea is to do an edited cassette tape of an interview with the author; the tape should give a listener an idea of who the author is, what she/he has written, why that person writes, probably some reading from the author's work, and perhaps some insight into the way that author did the writing. The accompanying slides would include pictures of the author, his/her home, places or persons the author regards as significant, and probably pictures of places or things which are the basis of parts of the authors composition—i.e., the picture of a courthouse which was described in a poem or story. Mrs. Phillis Connor [Alpine High School, Alpine, Tx. 79109], West Texas Representative on the Executive Board, has offered to coordinate efforts on the project; anyone who is interested in participating should write to Mrs. Connor.

Project on Acted Versions of Important Literature: The basis for the project is a belief that, although tapes and filmstrips by famous actors [Burton and Taylor in *Antony and Cleopatra*] may be useful teaching devices, the very skill of the performers prevents an urge to imitate by school students. It is a fact that many fine performances of "classics" are done in Texas Schools each year. The project is to put together a set of slides from some of those performances, accompanied by readings by the students who are actors in the presentations and necessary editorial comment by a "prologue." It is hoped that the result will be useful as teaching devices and that students viewing what their peers have done will be moved to say, "We can do it too." The performances do not have to be limited to Shakespeare, or to plays, but they should deal with items of literature which are used in Texas schools. Dr. Allen Briggs [Texas A & I University at Laredo, Box 537, Laredo, Tx. 78040], Chairperson of the Elections Standing Committee of the Executive Board, has agreed to coordinate efforts in this area; persons interested in becoming involved should write him.

It is hoped that, should either or both these ideas become an official project of the TJCTE, provision will be made through which the tapes and the slides (or filmstrips from the slides) can be made available to members of the Council. □

DESIGNING A SCIENCE FICTION ELECTIVE

Patricia Lamley

A science fiction elective in the English program can work and work well. By this time nearly every English teacher is aware that across the country many colleges offer courses in science fiction and the course offerings are rapidly spreading into the high schools. Many English teachers use an occasional science fiction short story or paperback science fiction novel in their classes now but are hesitant to do much more than that. A twelve-week science fiction course can become part of the English curriculum. It is a popular course and appeals to many different types of students, particularly if the course is individualized. A teacher can easily choose novels and short stories for classwork and set up an outside reading program to coordinate with the classwork.

With the quarter system in Texas, a twelve-week upper level course in science fiction can be a viable alternative to the standard English course. If the school system has taken advantage of the quarter system to move to a predominately elective curriculum, the science fiction course can easily be one of these courses. If the school has not moved to a full elective system, the science fiction course can still be a most interesting senior elective.

A full English elective curriculum was introduced at R. L. Turner High School in Carrollton-Farmers Branch during the 1973-74 school year by which juniors and seniors were in the same classes. Juniors were required to take three twelve-week English courses and seniors could elect to take from one to three courses if they wished to do so. Of the approximately twenty-one courses available to the juniors and seniors, science fiction was one of the most popular, making more sections than nearly any other English course.

Juniors and seniors seem to have no trouble adjusting to being in the same class together in an English course of this type. One must remember that, traditionally, the two levels have been mixed in such subjects as speech, drama, or business.

The larger problem for the teacher occurs because of the difference in learning ability and scholastic achievement of students who sign up for such a course. Many slower students sign up for a science fiction course because they think it will be easy. They reason that they have been to the movies and seen such science fiction films as *Planet of the Apes* or *Westworld*. They have watched *Star Trek* on TV and are currently watching *Six Million Dollar Man*, and isn't that science fiction? They may never have read a science fiction short story or novel, but a science fiction course will be a "snap," and they can make easy English grades whereas they might fail a traditional English course.

Other students who sign up for a science fiction course are at the other end of the spectrum. These are the students who make excellent grades and are interested in intellectual ideas. They see the course as one of stimulation and interest. Often they are in advanced science courses and sometimes they are already acquainted with a broad range of science fiction writing.

A third group of students may also sign up for a science fiction course. These are students who make their grades only in courses which hold a high degree of interest for them. Every course which they cannot see as relevant to themselves and the present, they fail. They may be fascinated by J. R. R. Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings* trilogy and see a science fiction course as allowing themselves an indulgence.

Structuring the Course

So, teachers must structure a science fiction course to meet the needs of widely varied students and still keep it an English course with a solid basis. They can achieve this end if they approach the structuring of a science fiction course with two basic ideas in mind: (1) Science fiction is rapidly becoming mainstream literature, and good science fiction must use established literary techniques to succeed; and (2) Science fiction is a literature of speculation on alternative futures, and since our world is changing so rapidly, young people must be able to adapt to and perhaps even control the changes which will occur, or they will have some sort of breakdown of their mental and intellectual processes. (See Alvin Toffler's *Future Shock* on this subject.) A science fiction course can show students that science fiction can be well-written literature and help them explore personal reactions to change.

Choosing an Anthology

A science fiction course may be divided into classwork and outside reading. Obviously, one way to approach the classwork is to read a number of short stories and novels in common and discuss them in class. The teacher, then, will wish to choose a short story anthology. The course at Turner used *Science Fiction Hall of Fame, Volume I*, edited by Robert Silverberg, because at the time of the organization of the course, it was one of the few anthologies available in paperback. It is an excellent anthology with well-written stories covering a range of thematic ideas. Experience has shown, however, that some of the stories are perhaps a little difficult for slower stu-

dents. If most students in the class are average or above average or addicted to science fiction, and if there are few slow students, *Science Fiction Hall of Fame* is a good choice because of its variety. With explanation, most slow students can understand the stories although not appreciate the author's less obvious literary techniques, his extrapolation of technology, or his sometimes rather refined and critical social comment. Several new teaching anthologies of science fiction have come on the market since the R. L. Turner course originated, and the teacher may wish to read several and choose one of them. Among those now available are the following:

Aldiss, Dick, ed., *Science Fiction: The Future*, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Brodkin, Sylvia Z. and Elizabeth J. Pearson, eds., *Science Fiction*, McDougal, Littell and Company.

Farrell, Edmund J., Thomas E. Gage, John Pfordresher, and Raymond J. Rodrigues, eds., *Science Fact/Fiction*, Scott, Foresman and Company.

Harrison, Harry and Carol Pugner, eds., *A Science Fiction Reader*, Charles Scribner's Sons.

Heintz, Bonnie L., Frank Herbert, Donald A. Joos, and Jane Agorn McGee, eds., *Tomorrow, and Tomorrow, and Tomorrow . . .* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Hollister, Bernard C., ed., *Another Tomorrow*, Pflaum Publishing.

Kelley, Leo P., ed., *Themes in Science Fiction: A Journey into Wonder*, Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Osborne, John and David Paskow, *Look Back on Tomorrow: Worlds of Science Fiction*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Whichever anthology is chosen I suggest that the stories be grouped thematically if the editors have not already done so. This grouping helps when discussions center on alternative futures which are possible. The teacher may decide on several theme areas, but I found it helpful to have class discussions the first few days of the class on the various thematic areas into which science fiction stories fall. These areas are numerous, and the ones listed here are only a few of the broad areas possible—destruction of the world, overpopulation, thought control, machine takeover/robots, contact with extraterrestrials, utopias and anti-utopias, time travel, galactic visions, and tampering with nature. The teacher will, of course, make sure no major area is omitted from the list which has been selected.

These discussions the first few days of class help the teacher identify which students know something about science fiction and which do not. Movies are usually mentioned which fall into the theme areas as are stories and novels which some students have read. An alert teacher will notice which students contribute with examples and use this information in counseling for the outside reading. The discussions also acquaint those students who know nothing about science fiction with the material they have chosen to read for the course. It is helpful, then, to classify as nearly as possible each story read into a thematic area. This classification gives students a means of comparison among the many stories they will read both in class and in outside reading.

Selecting Novels

In choosing novels for class study, teachers must try to keep in mind the abilities of students so that the novels are not too intellectually difficult or easy; they must choose novels which show the development of science fiction writing historically and novels which show a variety of thematic areas. We found that it works well to choose novels which relate thematically to groups of short stories which are taught in class and to teach in these thematic units. We chose four novels for classwork for the course. As the course is repeatedly taught, the novels can be changed as class sets wear out or as teachers find others which they judge better or more suitable for their classes.

The Time Machine by H. G. Wells is a short novel which can be used to relate to the theme of time travel as well as to give an example of early science fiction. The plot is simple, but some students may have trouble with the vocabulary and social comments Wells makes on his own time period.

On the Beach by Nevil Shute works well showing the post-atomic blast theme. The characterization is interesting and the students can be given a chance to forecast their own actions in a similar situation. Since *On the Beach* is pessimistic, *Alas, Babylon* might be used instead as a novel which is a little more optimistic.

Orphans of the Sky by Robert Heinlein can be used effectively to show the development of a society which has been isolated. The technology of the space ship is also interesting in this adventure story.

Farenheit 451 by Ray Bradbury is an excellent book for class study. Bradbury uses interesting extrapolation in developing his future society and the students have no difficulty in seeing his social criticism of our present society. *Farenheit 451* also makes use of literary devices which are interesting—notably, Biblical allusion. It is a superior book to teach.

The choice of novels to use in class must be the teacher's own after reading a variety. There are a few books available which may help in making the decision. Pflaum Publishing has several books on science fiction, three of which may be particularly helpful: *Teaching Tomorrow: A Handbook of Science Fiction for Teachers* by Elizabeth Calkins and Barry McGhan, *Grokking the Future: Science Fiction in the Classroom* by Bernard C. Hollister and Deane C. Thompson, and *Science Fiction Primer for Teachers* by Suzanne Millies. A teacher might also find helpful the *Arizona English Bulletin*, Volume 15, Number 1, October 1972, as the entire issue is devoted to science fiction in the English classroom.

Organizing for Evaluation

One way to accommodate the differing abilities of the students who sign up for a science fiction course is to divide the evaluation between classwork and

outside reading. The teacher may devise a personal ratio; however, we found that ⅔ of the grade based on classwork material (pop tests, essays, unit tests) and ⅓ based on completion of outside reading worked rather well. This method takes into consideration that each individual student confer with the teacher in setting the outside reading requirement and grade. Dividing the weight of the grade gives the slow student who has difficulty taking tests and writing papers the opportunity to pass by completing the outside reading.

One method of organizing the outside reading is to have a set contract with a specific number of science fiction novels and short stories to be read for each grade achieved. We found that another method, an individual counseling method, seemed to work better on outside reading, however. Each student talks with the teacher about personal capabilities and sets the number of novels and short stories to be read and determines what grade that amount of work is worth as an individual. Most students judge their abilities accurately and a poor student chooses to read very little over the minimum one novel and three short stories, but the student also values a minimum amount of work with a minimum outside reading grade. The excellent student, by the same token, takes on a much larger load of outside reading for a higher grade. The teacher, of course, uses personal judgment and the two of them must agree on the amount of outside reading for the agreed on grade.

So, how does the overworked teacher know the student has read the outside material? The method we used was a rather short form on a 5 × 8 index card for each outside reading whether it was a novel or short story. No grade was given on the quality of the card, but the teacher checked each card before filing and had the student rewrite any which were unacceptable. The contracted grade was earned by simply completing the amount of reading agreed upon. From anonymous questionnaires at the end of each course taught, we found that a negligible minority of the students faked cards and said they read something which they had not. The more common practice was simply not to turn in the amount of reading agreed upon and accept a lower grade on outside reading than originally agreed upon. The following form was used for the reading cards:

Author — Short story or novel
Title — Theme area
One word evaluation

Setting: one line

Time: one line

Plot: three or four sentences including names of main characters

Theme statement: one or two sentences

Analysis: your evaluation of theme and concepts presented

The theme statement and analysis may be put on the back of the card if more room is necessary.

The following reading card is an example of student work:

Kuttner, Joseph E. — Short Story
"Rust" — Robots
Gates to Tomorrow — Dull
Ed. Andre Norton

Setting: future earth from present (1939)

Time: one hundred years in the future

Plot: Before the story actually took place, man had invented robots to kill men in wars. Soon these robots, built to kill men, united and killed all men on Earth. The robots started malfunctioning and ceased activity due to the rusted parts. This left no intelligent being or creation to inhabit Earth.

Theme: Man's modern technology may defeat him in his desire to make life easier.

Analysis: The robots in this story did not conform to the three laws of robotics. They were built only to kill the "men in the yellow uniforms" but also took matters into their own hands and decided to take over the whole world. This would require individual thinking of which no robot is supposed to be capable.

Since one of the purposes of the outside reading is to acquaint the student with a broad range of science fiction authors and their work, it is helpful to the student if the teacher provides a list of the names of a number of science fiction authors to facilitate finding novels in the library. Also helpful would be a list of the science fiction novels contained in the school library. Obviously, though, the student should not be confined to the school library as many prefer to buy paperbacks. A classroom library of science fiction paperbacks is also helpful.

Because the reading load is heavy, students must be given some class time in which to read. For the novels and even the short stories studied in class, it is also helpful to students to have study questions as they read the novel or short story. With each story or novel read, there are usually several possibilities for short paper topics on some aspect of the story, some literary device used, or the student's reaction to some aspect of the story. Both objective and essay tests can easily be constructed on the theme units and a comprehensive final is possible if the teacher constructs essay questions like the following:

> Many science fiction writers are prophets of doom. They picture the human race declining and on its way to destruction or extinction. In the following stories, discuss the state of each declining society. What does each author present as the major reason or reasons for that decline? Also indicate what each author thinks (as presented in the book) could prevent the destruction of mankind.
>
> "Twilight" *On the Beach* *Fahrenheit 451*

> Much Science fiction writing falls into one of the following thematic areas: (list the areas the class has decided on). Choose one category and discuss its use as a thematic area of science fiction writing. Illustrate your discussion with examples from at least two of your outside reading selections.

A science fiction course in English curriculum can be an informative one for the students to take and an exciting one for teachers to teach. Such a course can expand the students' appreciation of literary technique and help them explore their reactions to alternative futures. Most of them enjoy the reading involved and do not rebel as readily against reading for this course as they do against reading for other English courses. A science fiction course can be a fine addition to the English curriculum. □

ARCHETYPALING IN THE CLASSROOM with special reference to Shakespeare

James Lynch

When I first began archetypaling in the classroom, I felt a little like an intoxicated novice skier on a steep slope at night. After four years, I no longer feel intoxicated—just mildly spaced out. It has been my experience, however, that the most serious enemy to the classroom use of archetypal theory lies not in the flaws of the approach, but in the deep prejudices of practical, common sensical scholars who harbor a natural aversion to what they think of as semi-mystical speculation. To develop the initial analogy: it would be easier for drunken voices on skis to negotiate the steep slope in the dark than it would be for them to explain to a practical realist why they went skiing at all. To those with common sense, skiing accomplishes nothing; they simply wear themselves out going over much travelled ground. It may be that, for a fruitful pursuit of archetypal theory, a willing suspension of common sense is required, but it has always seemed to me that the same is required in reading most great literature. Creative writers will generally leave common sense matters to politicians, farmers, and academicians. Common sense is anti-intellectual and unimaginative; it wakes up, puts its boots on, does its chores, and goes to sleep. Dr. Johnson to the contrary, common sense is all too common. It is, as James Joyce described it, a "beast of boredom." It is perhaps best to meet this galumping attitude head on before I describe what I think is the method and special value of the archetypal approach.

There is a brand of Philistinism abroad today which passes itself off as realistic and practical scholarship. Academic Philistines want only facts about the literature they read, facts as solid as hard-boiled eggs, hard-boiled facts for hard-boiled scholars. They are not about to be taken in by any far-fetched theory of some goofy mystic who peddles looney tunes to the gullible masses, no sir; they are far too shrewd and much too worldly-wise to swallow that flashy bait about "dying gods," "earth mothers," and "Christ figures." You can't fool them with your Jungian can of worms, your Frazerian labyrinthe of analogies.

In the name of common sense, the hard-boiled scholar lets us know that archetypalism should not presume to wear an undeserved dignity. Readers who find biblical and mythological analogies in the works they read, and who, moreover, audaciously suggest that seeing such analogies may improve readers' understanding of the works, are the stuff that the practical realist's jokes are made of. Let's have an end to this digging up of Christ figures and the like, unless, of course, there is hard, rigorous evidence to prove that the figures we've dug up have been legitimately resurrected. Presumably, for a character to qualify as a Christ figure to those of common sense, it is necessary to be born in Bethlehem and die on Calvary, in addition to having God knows how many more correspondences to Christ. Suggestive likenesses between a literary character and a mythic one must be ignored; if authors had meant us to find earth mothers in their works, they'd have told us to look for them.

Although there is no question that the search for archetypal figures, patterns, and symbols may become folly, our notions of what is foolish are closely allied to how much complexity we can tolerate. If pursuing suggestive likenesses is wrong, however, if comparisons are odious, why, let's do away with archetypalism, and while we're at it let's purge poetry of metaphor. Let there be no more of those nasty, confusing symbols that have no exact correspondence to something else. Let be be finale of seem; the only arbitrator is the hard-boiled fact. It is possible that the practical realist's creed of common sense may harbor more dubious ends than those of twenty silly figure-hunting archetypalists who demand not the certainty of a tide table before they hazard their analogies.

There are, moreover, reasons other than natural aversion which might put off readers from seriously considering the archetypal approach to literature. One which I've already alluded to is the tendency of archetypalists to go berserk in their explanations of what such and such a pattern or symbol, a circle say, means in a work. Jung himself warned against the mere accumulation of parallels, regardless of context. A circle may or may not be an archetypal symbol of wholeness or the godhead or the womb, or it may be so to various extents in different works; it depends, according to Jung, on how the symbol is "shaped and elaborated," how it is presented.

Another reason for the negative attitude toward archetypalism is the simplistic treatment of the approach in the anthologies and handbooks which give a page or two explaining it. Perhaps more than any other point of view on literature, the archetypal one suffers from encapsulation. There is, too, a kind of disservice done to themselves by archetypal critics when they adopt the glib, oddly humorous terms of psychologists in talking about "the shadow within," "the tree penis," "returns to the womb," and the like. Even the term "earth mother" may conjure up a mildly ludicrous image, hence causing a normally open mind to close ever so slightly. If readers looked into Frazer's *Golden Bough* under fertility goddesses, or, better yet, into Eric Neumann's *The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype,* there would, I think be less of a tone of snide condescension in the academician's use of the phrase "earth mother." (A tone which, by the way, infuriatingly rubs off on students, who may be, and probably are, totally ignorant of what the phrase is meant to imply.)

Though Jungian criticism has been poorly received in scholarly circles, I wish to consider more closely what it actually involves and what value it has. From the very outset, we face a problem of definition: what is an archetype? The OED says, "the original pattern or model from which copies are made." But that is not the only sense in which Jung used the word; unfortunately Jung and Jungians seem to use the word differently at different times.

Appropriate analogies are forever being sought to help define the nature of the numinous archetype. J. R. R. Tolkien compares imaginative stories to a satisfying bowl of soup and their archetypal content to the bones of the ox from which it has been boiled. Anthony Storr compares the archetype to the lost parent word in linguistic theory from which two words of remarkable similarity patently derive.

Archetypes, which lay at the deepest roots of the psyche, are like the unseen seed which produces the plant, or, to use one of Jung's analogies, they are like atoms, hidden forces of great explosive power, depending of course on one's ripeness to receive the archetypal image.

Oliver Evans and Harry Finestone, in *The World of the Short Story: Archetypes in Action,* give an excellent overview of the history of the idea of archetypes. It will surprise no one to hear that Plato, Blake, Yeats, and Hesse write about archetypes in their expository prose, though not in explicitly Jungian terms; it is surprising, however, to find that Aristotle, Sir Philip Sidney, Kant, and T. S. Eliot attribute some importance to ideas very similar to Jung's. And, needless to say, some of the most prestigious, innovative, and imaginative criticism of the 20th century (Joseph Campbell's, Northrop Frye's, Leslie Fiedler's) has its roots in archetypal theory.

Archetypes reside in the collective unconscious, a component of the psyche which in Jungian theory underlies both consciousness and the personal unconscious. The existence of the collective unconscious is perhaps Jung's most famous postulate and as such his best known contribution to psychological theory. He was led to posit its existence from his prodigious studies in dreams and comparative mythology. The numerous cases he found in which an individual's dreams could in no way be accounted for by the individual's past forced him to assume the existence of "a collective psychic substratum." The psyche, Jung reasoned, is likely to be as similar among human beings as the physical body is: different in many details (stemming from consciousness and personal unconscious) but alike in all the essentials: these essentials were the clusters of archetypes inherited at birth. Human bodies may have different head sizes and different color eyes, but they all have one head and two eyes. Here I would like to interject a note about basic predilections in seeking out likenesses or differences among artistic works.

Needless to say, the Jungian or one temporarily adopting the Jungian point of view is more interested in analogies than distinctions, more interested in the ingredients of his soup than in its particularized flavor. To know something about the seed is not irrelevant to the study of the plant.

If the archetypal approach to literature has any value, it lies in enabling us to recognize more fully what we have been responding to in our reading, even if we were unaware of the unseen ingredients shaping our response. If we can identify the archetypal content of a play or story (which is different from describing the numinous archetype) we may be able to discern more clearly why we like or dislike it without resorting to sophistical explanations, and hence we may ultimately come to understand some of the causes of our aesthetic prejudices and biases. For Jung the archetypal content of a work of art is of paramount importance: It enthralls and overpowers us, and "makes it possible for us to find our way back to the deepest springs of life."

Personally, I find this theory not only interesting but difficult to refute. It is not the consummate craftsmanship in Michelangelo's "Pieta," for example, to which I respond most deeply, remarkable as that craftsmanship is. I do not love it for what we call its "artistry"; a Czarist Easter Egg—the size of one's fist, containing a coach and six, with figures inside the coach in detail—is made with more craft, but elicits no emotional response. The Jungian speculates the power of the piece derives from the way *conjunctio* archetype, the perfect union of separate beings, is figured in this version of the madonna and child relationship, a version which gains in complexity by depicting union in death. Similarly, it is not the structure of *King Lear,* however tight and formally beautiful that is, which calls out a deep response to the play and sometimes makes one tremble while witnessing a good production of it. Neither is it the image patterns, nor the thematic unity, nor even the characterizations, nor is it what is these days referred to with something like a lump in the throat, the poetry. One admires structural precision and formal beauty but is rarely moved by them. The characters in *Lear* are all essentially flat; no one even comes close to the complexity of Hamlet, for instance. I believe the reason why the play hits with such shattering force is indeed the way the basic archetypal pattern, the expulsion of the king from the perfect security of the court/womb into the painful physical

universe/heath, has been "elaborated and shaped." Can it be gratuitous that Lear's daughters are called his mothers, that Lear is described as a babe/child, that each of his daughters/mothers (including, and most importantly, Cordelia) rejects him, that Lear's court at the outset is depicted as such an encircled shelter from reality that the womb analogy almost inevitably suggests itself? Obviously, audiences need not have been rejected by their mothers to feel Lear's pain, and is it not curious that whole audiences for generation after generation would feel such a degree of sympathy for the old man as to cause them real emotional distress? It seems more likely that the Lear story acts out and gives best shape to a pattern in the possession of every human psyche, a pattern which moves us more surely and more deeply than any number of prosodic excellences, integrated images, and adept reworkings of source materials.

Archetypalists make it their business to discern and describe such patterns in literature, using whatever help anthropologists and psychologists can give them. They read mythologies, study religions, and take an interest in folklore, as well as personal dreams (and the dreams of their daughters). Recurrent patterns in these myths and religious stories are of the greatest importance to them.

The task of literary archetypalists, hence, is twofold: to determine as thoroughly as they may the archetypal content of a work and to puzzle through what kind of response such content is likely to evoke. Shylock's idiosyncracies and eccentricities of character, for example, are entertaining, interesting, and dramatically important matters, but archetypalists forego interest in these idiosyncracies, in what makes characters unique, for the sake of pursuing the broader patterns into which characters seem to fit, for the sake of seeing figures in relation to their ancestors and to notice the family resemblances. Blood lines in literary characters are often as telling as those in race horses. Just as the sire of a colt tells more about the colt than the color of the mane, the silhouetted mythological figure behind the individual may reveal more than the peculiarities of physical appearance. And indeed, the peculiarities may obscure or distract our attention from fundamental features, as a scar does from the expression on a face. Individual characteristics are mostly accidents of birth or a consequence of diet; they do not tell us a great deal about people. Even matters of race, religion, social class, nationality and such are accidents, important as they are in shaping our personalities. Archetypalists are not so much concerned that Shylock is Jewish as they are that Shylock is an Alien, not so much concerned with Shylock's hatred of Antonio as with Shylock's desire to devour ("feed fat" on) his enemy, like Cronos, Polyphemus, and other darkly paternal figures *ad infinitum*, not so much concerned with Shylock's particular punishment as with the scapegoat pattern in the trial scene. Shylock's activation of the Terrible Father archetype will cost him severely in his account with an audience's emotional allegiance, but the archetypal scapegoat pattern will recoup some of his losses at the trial. The contradictory archetypal content in Shylock's role may be why there is and always has been such controversy about his character; a full-blown archetypal point of view on *The Merchant of Venice* may be found in Leslie Fiedler's *The Stranger in Shakespeare*.

The Jungian also studies fairy tales, recent psychological interpretations of which have suggested that the presence and presentation of archetypes in them are a major reason for the widespread appeal and longevity of the tales. It seems as if there must be some unconscious reason why some tales get told once in one generation and get quickly forgotten while others get told always, everywhere—especially when one's critical faculties cannot say why this happens. Similarly, unless a literary work touches some deep chord in us, it may be forgotten by all but aestheticians even though it is of extremely high artistic quality. Every year dozens of Ph.D. dissertations prove the artistic merit of works only dozens of people have heard of.

The archetypalist ought not, however, to value whatever contains much archetypal appeal over that which contains little. Readers might, in such a case, be led to prize "Jack and the Beanstalk" over, say, Ben Jonson's *Catiline*, or to cherish equally a life-size print of the "Pieta" and the "Pieta" itself.

As we might expect, Shakespeare's plays have proved a haven for archetypaling: in just such works as have so pleased and jolted multitudes for so long, pattern/figure/symbol hunters are likely to find treasure. Indeed, they would probably invent patterns if they had to, because if their approach did not work with Shakespeare, they could not face a scholarly/critical/academic community which has been inundated with Shakespearean examples in support of every conceivable method of understanding literature from the existential to the potaphysical. As it happens, archetypes in Shakespeare overwhelm us.

The first full-scale Jungian view of Shakespeare, *Psyche and Symbol in Shakespeare*, has recently been written by Alex Aronson. I find it a disappointment, largely because of its clinical nature: Aronson knows Jung's works much better than he knows Shakespeare's. The Fiedler book is much more successful, perhaps because it restricts itself to one archetypal figure, the stranger (alien, exile, wanderer, outsider). It requires a Herculean effort to give an overview of archetypes in Shakespeare in one volume, as Aronson attempts; it is difficult enough to cover a single figure or pattern with any thoroughness.

Ever since Frazier, Cornford, Harrison, and Murray and the school of Cambridge anthropologists pointed out the likenesses between Christian myth and the myths of other cultures, between the dying god of Christianity and Adonis, Osiris, Wotan, etc., the archetypal fit has been on. Jung's researches and theories have impelled the search for recurring patterns into contemporary systems of belief, literatures, and into the dreams of modern man. □

• James Lynch teaches English at Oregon State University, Corvallis.

THE CLAUDIUS COVER-UP:
a psychology of politics in *Hamlet*

Daniel R. Bronson

a prologue

The following brief essay is the summation of an attempt to teach a familiar work, Shakespeare's Hamlet, *to introductory literature classes. With greatly differing levels of sophistication as well as interest, the problem was to devise a way into the play with which students could feel some familiarity and understanding. The events of recent political history seemed to present a jumping off point that was not forced, but resonant with similar characters and motivations. By seizing on Claudius and his motives, I was not implying a literal parallel to Watergate. What I tried to convey, with some success, was that the political considerations of Shakespeare depicted were not at all alien nor outdated. Grasping this allowed access into the play for a good many students who otherwise would have dismissed it.*

Impressions of *Hamlet* invariably revolve about that revenge-minded prince for whom the play is named. Audiences may recall Gertrude—Hamlet's mother, aunt, and queen or Ophelia—the ill-fated lady who seems the arch-victim of everyone else's actions. There are other characters like Polonius, Horatio, or Laertes, who may or may not be remembered. Rosencrantz and Gildenstern, spear carriers of the first order, have been given a drama of their own. Finally there is the king of Denmark—Hamlet's uncle, Claudius. Generally we take him for granted.

Nobody cares about Claudius. There he is, a device, a stumbling block for Hamlet to overcome. Do we really bother with him or consider his motivations beyond the most superficial level? After all, it's not his play. And Claudius' villainy seems so obvious, even conventional in its expression. We have no time for such characters. Or do we?

The title to this essay implies the contemporary echoes of characters and situations in Shakespeare's play. Claudius is well worth taking seriously because he is far more a reflection of ourselves and our world than any Hamlet could be. Politics is filled with far more bureaucrats calculating and fumbling their ways to power than it is with intellectual princes. Claudius is particularly significant because he is the archetypal politician.

What do we know about Claudius? What are the facts Shakespeare gives us? He is king of Denmark, successor to his brother's title and wife. This much is sure. Depending on whom you believe or which critic you read, Claudius has or has not killed his brother to gain the crown. Let us leave that thought for a moment, however. The immediate question on entering *Hamlet* is why this man, not Hamlet, is king. It is a good question, one Shakespeare does not answer directly. Of course, any decently annotated edition of the play will inform you that Danish monarchs of the period were elected, presumably like a papal election. The assumption is that while Hamlet has been off playing the student all these years Claudius has been home drumming up enough support to guarantee his election and Hamlet's discontent.

How firm is Claudius' hold on Denmark? Tenuous at best. What are the problems he faces which menace his position and power? For one, there is the external threat of young Fortinbras, poised on Denmark's borders with an army. For another, there is young Hamlet, an internal threat whose dissatisfaction at the turn of events should be apparent. From the play's inception, both men have grievances against Claudius which could prove explosive for him.

That is not all. Plainly, perhaps most importantly, Claudius is not a favorite of the people. Perhaps his marriage to Gertrude was an attempt to consolidate power and pacify certain factions even at the risk of being deemed incestuous. Certainly the marriage could be construed as a public act to demonstrate continuity. In any case, Hamlet is popular. The king's initial desire to have Hamlet remain at court suggests manifold wisdom. Whether he likes his nephew or not, Claudius would be a fool to allow a disturbed, potential rival escape his watchful eye. Moreover it may be beneficial to keep a favorite of the people around, ready for display. Some of that popularity may rub off.

Of course none of this works to Claudius' satisfaction. Hamlet is so popular that Claudius fears having him eliminated at home, even after the murder of Polonius demonstrates the necessity for immediate remedies. The results of an improperly handled assassination could be personally disastrous for the king. However the news of Hamlet's demise would be a long time getting back from England, and suspicions or blame easily could be shifted.

As if all this were not enough, when Laertes returns home to uncover the facts concerning his father's death, the people are all too ready to follow him in revolt—this man who appears to have spent little more than three months in Denmark in the past few years. The curious notion that the people seem to prefer most those men they have seen least has definite bearing on the familiar figure who now rules. What we can assume is that a significant number of people are waiting for the slightest provocation to attempt to remove Claudius from office. Even his success in foreign affairs, defusing the Fortinbras situa-

tion, has not dispelled lingering discontent with or doubts about his fitness to rule.

Anyone familiar with Shakespeare's plays well knows the fickle nature of the people in relation to their rulers. *Julius Caesar* and *Coriolanus* are prime examples in which this phenomenon is depicted. The point, however, is not that the people appear to prefer others to Claudius. What is significant is that Claudius is aware of this state and increasingly acts in accordance with a personal belief that he can ill afford to let his standing slip any farther. His support must not erode. As the play progresses, Claudius is depicted as a man attempting with growing desperation to maintain the status quo and keep the lid on a delicate, volatile situation.

Originally I believed Claudius must have murdered his brother in order to justify his actions in the play's latter part. Now I am not so sure it matters. For someone in so precarious a position, the rumor of such a damnable act could be as damaging as proof of fact, provided the right person(s) spread the story. Hamlet's personal stake in the political affairs at court might make him an unlikely source for such news at first, but not after the death of Polonius. Certainly it is murder, but there are too many questions. People are going to want to know what an old man, a trusted agent of the king, was doing hiding in the queen's bedchamber spying on a conversation between mother and son. Talk of madness from an unpopular monarch might go unheard in the face of contradictory charges of regicide from a popular young man somehow involved in a strange plot. The murder of Polonius would lend credence to Hamlet's potential claims. Better to get the young man away as soon as possible before anyone becomes curious.

This explains the decision to bundle Hamlet off hurriedly to England. The murder of Polonius opens far too many doors for comfort. Likewise the hushing over of all details related to the old man's death springs from the same need. Questions might lead back beyond Hamlet. Claudius cannot afford to face such potential accusations, true or not. The solution is to cover up the greatest degree possible.

Of course, this first cover-up (second, if you believe Claudius has killed his brother) has its repercussions. Laertes hurries back from France seeking knowledge and vengeance. Claudius is able to turn this fury away from himself, but the audience is left to wonder. Can Claudius ever fully trust someone who has threatened to kill him, especially when he knows Laertes has become as much a potential rallying point for the people as young Hamlet ever was? It is something to contemplate in the light of later events.

Ophelia's death and Hamlet's return multiply Claudius' woes. As if one questionable death were not enough, now he has another to explain. As the conversation between the two grave-diggers demonstrates, rumor already has started the people wondering at the royal goings on. Matters easily could become worse, even drastically so.

The answer is to deny Ophelia's suicide. Clearly it was a king's power which encouraged the coroner to allow Ophelia's burial in holy ground. But was this a Christian act motivated by goodness or a political "big lie," another necessary step to an escalating cover-up? Burying Ophelia in church ground denies all credence to the rumors concerning her death, once again hopefully keeping questions from leading back to Claudius. A display of grief and a temporary alliance with the bereaved Laertes, the people's favorite, should enable the king to weather this latest political storm.

Hamlet's return upsets everything. Have all these elaborate machinations been for nothing? Suddenly Claudius is presented with two distinct threats to his shaky hold on the throne, for Hamlet's return must reignite Laertes' fury. Certainly Hamlet must be up to something or he would have shown his hand by now. That he appears to be waiting for the best moment to strike can be only a surer sign of his danger to Claudius. Likewise Laertes must be kept from making any wrong connections between Hamlet and his uncle, or any right ones. Once again, Claudius is presented with a situation which can be handled only with deception.

The duel: Could it be that Claudius arranges this event not to eliminate Hamlet but either, or hopefully both, of the participants? Certainly any of these outcomes would abet the king's schemes. If Laertes kills Hamlet, the shared knowledge that it was the young man who insisted on poisoning his blade may keep Laertes in thrall. If not, some charges always can be trumped up. If by the wildest stretch of the imagination Hamlet kills Laertes, at least there will be one less menace with which to contend. Perhaps Hamlet can be sent on another ocean voyage, or other carefully planned arrangements for his elimination can be made. Is it likely either man will remain a favorite of the people once they learn he has killed the other? And if they chance to kill each other . . . Well Claudius can merely dream of such relief.

Unfortunately for Claudius another accidental death destroys his complex maneuverings. Much of the blame must be put at his feet. He has thought up the poisoned cup which is pure overkill. It is significant that Claudius still covers up to the end. When Gertrude crumbles before the assembled spectators, he has the consistency of character and presence of mind to improvise another big lie, announcing her collapse to be merely a faint from excitement. A nice, if feeble, try. Claudius goes down before Hamlet's final assault, all his machinations for naught. Nonetheless one can imagine Claudius at the day of judgment claiming to the end, "I am not a . . . regicide!"

Only Horatio is left at the play's end, which means that Hamlet's version of events is the one the people will hear. This demonstrates, especially in the prince's refusal to allow Horatio to join him in death, that the young man has learned something from his uncle about controlling public opinion. Not even the judgment of history will soften Claudius' fall. Nonetheless his lesson, if we will stop long enough to perceive it, is that the politics of insecurity do not change. Perhaps we always knew that, or should have. □

• Daniel Bronson teaches English at Montclair State College, New Jersey.

TEXANS WRITE

F. Allen Briggs

This section of reviews is a regular feature of English in Texas. It is limited to the review of books by Texas authors and to books which are about Texas. Emphasis will be given to books which may be useful to schools, teachers, and students, but items of more general interest will also be considered. The section can best serve its purpose through the help of Council members and others in the profession. The reviewer solicits information about new Texas books and correspondence with persons who will assist in writing the reviews.

This column is being written while the memory of NBC's great red and blue map is still fresh; the election is over and, in the American Way, people are engaged in going on from what once seemed an important crisis. The thing that is most troublesome about the memory of that map is that the colors weren't mixed very much; there was an east-west division as sharp as the north-south one was a century ago. Of course the vote was too close in most states to suppose that rebellion or secession is immediate, but the map may have shown something that was obscured in the popular vote.

The campaign, and the thinking which produced the strategy, emphasized the "groups"—the Catholic vote, the Jewish vote, the labor vote, the Black block, the Mexican-American appeal, the Southern solidarity. Again and again the media insisted that the United States is divided, with conflicting interests and opposite ideas. Commentators seemed surprised that Americans from many places had like concerns and made similar decisions; the vote seemed to say that Americans are one.

But Americans, like other human beings, tend to believe that they are what they are told they are. With the tendency to fragment the people of this land the thoughtful teacher must battle using the weapon of wholeness. Resolve again to make full use of the wide resources of American local color literature to help students know and understand their American neighbors throughout this wide land. But be careful to distinguished between the usual and the atypical; I enjoy "Miss Emily," but she never was a typical, Southern lady.

Carroll, Lewis. *The Rectory Magazine* [facsimile edition with introduction by Jerome Blump]. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1976. $7.50.

The Rectory Magazine is a glimpse into another world. The original was done in a six-month period when C. L. Dodgson was thirteen, although it is probable that some changes were made in the manuscript during the next five years. The reproduction here is of the handwritten copy presently in Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center of the University of Texas. Although the someday-to-be Lewis Carroll did much of the writing and publishing (hand printing), some items are signed by other initials and more than a single hand is to be seen in the copy.

People with a reasonably comprehensive survey course in English literature knew that children, in that disadvantaged time before television, amused themselves by writing their own books and magazines—the Brontes and Dickens come first to mind. Even fewer than fifty years ago, children did the same thing, and the enterprising got a hand printing press (or as technology progressed, a hectograph) and sold copies and even ads. Do children still so write without the iron hand of an insistent teacher? There must be some, somewhere--at least some who produce their own TV programs instead of passively sitting as do their elders. The urge to communicate is not dead.

The Rectory Magazine is a mixed bag of literature—a real magazine. There are poems, sketches, descriptions, serialized stories; some seem relatively serious in intent but others presage their author(?)-editors future outlook as they visit a never-never land or satirize the foibles of the adult magazines of the time. There is even a "letters to the editor" section in several of the issues, and one cannot help wondering if the editor did not have to elicit, if not write, the letters he answered. The editor writes under six sets of assumed initials (three times as many as were used by any other Dogdson child), but there is not yet to be seen the magic "L. C."

From the book there can spring hundreds of research papers (of which I would approve for, at least at present, plagiarism would be difficult), dozens of M.A. theses, and even a dull dissertation or two. *The Rectory Magazine* belongs in every college library. I would like to see a teaching unit written around this book and *Alice,* aimed at a fast group of ninth or tenth graders; I can't predict what would happen but the experiment would be fun.

The present publication disappoints, however; whether the lacks are a result of U.T. Press editorial policy or Professor Blump's choice, it is not possible to tell. At least a Chronology of Dogdson would have been welcome. A history of the manuscript before it became a part of the Ransom collection is, it seems, in order. The appendices of footnotes which clear up references and indicate items being imitated or satirized probably will await the doctoral toil of dedicated young scholars. What is available is a source book, not the finished work. F.A.B. □

Moore, Mary Jane. *Heir to a Pair of Boots.* San Antonio: Naylor Press, [P. O. Box 1838], 1976. $4.95.

The passage time when a boy turns into a man is a favorite subject for novelists; most often such books are written from the memories of a male author and are either autobiography or wish-fantasy. This short novel, written by a woman and told in the first person by a minor but concerned character in the story, is romantic. Russ Calhoun Brady grows up just as any good mother would wish her son to mature; whether

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. Postage Paid
Commerce, Texas
Permit No. 63

what Ms. Moore has seen is what would actually happen is a question her male readers will have to answer on the basis of their own remembrance.

Mary Moffett, a kindly and too-fat widow, becomes cook and part-time housekeeper [between the visits of Rositia, the once-a-week cleaning lady who is a fiend after dirt] on the Calhoun spread. Ward Calhoun, who made the ranch and its oil fields by his own smarts and labor, is trying to make a man out of his grandson Russ, a 19-year-old flunkout from an eastern college. Russ is torn between his western ranch heritage (the white hat in the story) and the effete Eastern patterns of life gained from his father: the East wears the black ten-gallon. Mary is the catalyst which enables them to become friends and lets Russ come out of his shell of loneliness and become first "a good-ole-boy" and then the replacement of his grandfather, who dies of a heart attack.

The book has two things going for it. In the first place, it is clean—the kind you can take home to Mama; Ms. Moore did not find it necessary to "tart-up" her book from the index of an abnormal psychology or the incidents of an X-rated "Adult" pamphlet. In the second place, she successfully resisted the temptation to make stereotypes out of her characters. Given the kind of novel it is and the fairly didactic message it bears, it would have been easy to have used two-dimensional figures. She never does; even the cowboys who work on the ranch are real, but all are drawn with art and economy.

I have the feeling that the kind of life, and even the system of values, in the novel would be strange and perhaps incomprehensible territory to urban lads in Corpus or Houston. As I recall the patterns in West Texas, however, I feel the book would say some very real things to a boy in Monahans or Tulia. It might even help the Gulfees to understand what makes people in the rest of the state believe like they do. F.A.B. □

Apropos of nothing at all, I close the column with a little quatrain occasioned by something I saw on the access road of the freeway the other morning as I drove to school.

To stop traffic is the aim
Of every belle and stud within the game;
But life is funny and perverse—
They stop it only with a hearse.

F.A.B. □

STEPHEN CRANE'S USE OF ANIMAL IMAGERY in "The Blue Hotel"

J. F. Peirce

Stephen Crane uses many animal images in "The Blue Hotel" which help to create a feeling of character and place.

Some of these images refer to animals directly, usually for purposes of comparison; for example: "The Palace Hotel . . . was painted a light blue, a shade that is on the legs of a kind of heron, causing the bird to declare itself against any background" (118)[1]. "The Swede sprang up with the celerity of a man escaping from a snake" (123), and "Scully turned upon him panther fashion"(134).

In some images the animal is merely suggested or implied: "Once he jabbed out harpoon-fashion with his fork to pinion a biscuit" (130), "The Swede was still bellowing" (134), and "Scully began to howl" (125).

Some of the images are in the form of similes: "The two combatants leaped forward and crashed together like bullocks" (135), "He turned to gaze dreamily at the scroll-like birds and bird-like scrolls which had been drawn on the mirror in the back of the bar" (141), and "At this reply the Swede ruffled out his chest like a rooster" (142).

Others are in the form of metaphors, some of them submerged: "In his eyes was the dying-swan look" (123), "'Why this is the wildest loon I ever seen'" (124), and "You're a bigger jackass than the Swede by a million majority'" (144).

Though Crane uses images of both wild and domesticated birds and animals, he uses none of fish. The one implied sea creature, the whale, is, of course, a mammal. □

Note

Stephen Crane, "The Blue Hotel," in *The Short Story: An Introductory Anthology*, ed by Robert Rees and Barry Menikoff (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1969), p. 118. All quotations are from this source, and page numbers are given in parentheses following the quotations.

• J. F. Peirce teaches English at Texas A & M University.